LUCRETIUS AND THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

W. DEN BOER • W. J. VERDENIUS • R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM QUADRAGESIMUM

BARBARA PRICE WALLACH

LUCRETIUS AND THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

LUCRETIUS AND THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH

DE RERUM NATURA III 830-1094

BY

BARBARA PRICE WALLACH

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

ISBN 90 04 04564 3

Copyright 1976 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permisson from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TO LUITPOLD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ix

I. Introduction 1

II. Book III, 830-1094: The Diatribe against the Fear of Death 11

III. Epilogue 110

Bibliography 117

Index 124

PREFACE

This study is the result of the investigations which I pursued in writing my doctoral dissertation, entitled *A History of the Diatribe from its Origin up to the First Century B.C. and a Study of the Influence of the Genre upon Lucretius III, 830-1094* (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1974; Professor Miroslav Marcovich, chairman). Chapters I and II are expanded versions of sections of that dissertation, and deal specifically with the diatribe and with rhetoric in Lucretius; chapter III, the Epilogue (not a part of my dissertation), is a discussion of various opinions which have been advanced concerning the purpose of poetry and the use of rhetoric in it, topics of obvious importance to anyone undertaking an examination of the use of rhetoric by an ancient poet.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor Laura V. Sumner of Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia, with whom I began the study of Roman epic poetry; to Professor M. Marcovich, who acted as my thesis director; to Professor Hans Herter of Bonn, West Germany, who read my dissertation and kindly made some suggestions; and to Professor Luitpold Wallach, my husband and former graduate advisor, to whom this monograph is dedicated.

Urbana, Illinois
March, 1975

Barbara P. Wallach

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In his article "Lucretius and the History of Satire" (*TAPA* 70, 1939, 380) Clyde Murley has observed that "Lucretius has been generally disregarded in the account of satire, though incidentally credited with satiric power." [1] A similar statement could be made about rhetoric in Lucretius, for most Lucretian scholars have disregarded the influence of that art upon the Epicurean poet, although they occasionally have noticed the clarity or persuasive power of sections of the *De rerum natura*. E. E. Sikes, for example, admits that in book III, "...Lucretius, so far from being hampered by 'the rules' [of rhetoric], found them a help to his inspiration." In an earlier passage, however, this same scholar observes that "the indignation of Lucretius is certainly not due to rhetoric, for although he may be rhetorical, he belonged to a generation too early to be corrupted, like Ovid and the Post-Augustans, with the worst features of that blot on Latin poetry." [2] When he denies that Lucretius' indignation is due to rhetoric, Sikes apparently is using the term "rhetoric" with a pejorative meaning, denoting insincerety, artificiality, and the adoption of a position only

---

[1] See also D. R. Dudley, "The Satiric Element in Lucretius," in *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence, London 1965), 115, for a brief summary of the treatment of satire in Lucretius. Dudley omits the important study "Lucrèce satirique" by René Waltz in *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé, Supplement: Lettres d'Humanité* 8 (1949), 78-103.

[2] E. E. Sikes, *Lucretius, Poet and Philosopher* (Cambridge 1936), 136 and 30. Cf. P. H. Schrijvers, *Horror ac divina voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce* (Amsterdam 1970), 9, who quotes both of these passages from Sikes. See also Schrijvers, 10-14, on the attitude of Pierre Boyancé (*Lucrèce et l'Épicurisme*, Paris 1963) toward rhetoric in Lucretius. Additionally noteworthy is the lack of a discussion of rhetoric in Cyril Bailey's 3 volume edition (with commentary) of the *De rerum natura* (Oxford 1947, rep. 1963), although Bailey does occasionally mention rhetorical elements in the poem (see, e.g., 156).

We should note here that Sikes fails to take into account the rhetorical nature of much of the Alexandrian literature which influenced Roman poetry; see, for example, Theocritus XVII.

For the influence of rhetoric on Latin poetry, see M. L. Clarke, "Rhetorical Influences in the Aeneid," *Greece and Rome* 18 (1949), 15-18.

pro forma, but without true feeling. The adjective "rhetorical", on the other hand, seems to be intended as an admission that the poet did employ various figures, topics, and devices commonly associated with the art of persuasion.

A similar attitude toward rhetoric is evinced by W. Y. Sellar, who states concerning Lucretius: "from the beginning to the end of the poem we feel that we are listening to a living voice speaking to us with the direct impressiveness of personal experience and conviction. No writer ever used words more clearly or more sincerely: no one shows a greater scorn for the rhetorical artifices which disguise the lack of meaning or insinuate a false conclusion by fine sounding phrases." [3] In support of his opinion Sellar quotes part of *De rerum natura* I 643-644.[4]

> . . . quae belle tangere possunt
> auris et lepido quae sunt fucata sonore.

These lines, however, are not directed against any rhetorician or rhetorical writer, but rather they are intended as a criticism of those "fools" who are impressed by a philosopher such as Heraclitus, who was "clarus ob obscuram linguam", and who, we may note here, antedated the beginning of rhetorical writing in Greece. Thus, Sellar does not support his own contention that Lucretius disliked rhetoric, but he does incidentally point out an important feature of the poet's attitude toward exposition, that is, that style and ornaments must not be allowed to obscure the "truth" which one wishes to express. As will be seen below (at footnote 11), this attitude need not be considered anti-rhetorical.

The obvious flaws in the opinions expressed by both Sikes and

---

[3] W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Republic* (Oxford 3rd. ed. 1905), 290. Schrijvers, 9, cites one portion of this quotation from Sellar, and he remarks the use of the term *rhetoric* "au sens péjoratif." See also W. S. Howell, "Rhetoric and Poetics: a Plea for the Recognition of the Two Literatures," *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. Luitpold Wallach (Ithaca 1966), 376.

[4] The standard text for all quotations from, and references to, the *De rerum natura* in the present study will be the three vol. edition (with commentary) by Cyril Bailey (Oxford 1947, rep. 1963).

Sellar mentions Thucydides I 21 as a parallel for this sentiment. Of course, Thucydides is not devoid of rhetoric, and he is not always an example of clarity. Cf., for instance, George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton 1963), 48-49; J. F. D'Alton, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism, A Study in Tendencies* (New York reprinted 1962), 259 (on Cicero's view of Thucydides), 492, 561.

Sellar, of course, are the omission of a definition of "rhetoric" and "rhetorical" and the use of the first of these terms in a manner which does not take into account its positive aspects but obviously stresses only the abuses to which the art was subject. If one follows Aristotle, however, who writes that all men use rhetoric and dialectic in some fashion, and who defines rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion," [5] then one cannot take the position that rhetoric necessarily disguises one's meaning or "insinuates" conclusions which do not follow from the premises which are presented. Further, even a narrow definition such as the following, provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, allows one to assume that rhetoric has a positive aspect: [6]

> Oratoris officium est de iis rebus posse dicere
> quae res ad usum civilem moribus et legibus
> constitutae sunt, cum adsensione auditorum,
> quoad eius fieri poterit.

In neither of these definitions is there any reference to insincerety or deception. On the contrary, anyone who had mastered the theories of Aristotle and the practical instruction given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* would have acquired tools to help him to write and to speak effectively, employing figures, of speech and of thought, which can clarify one's meaning or impress it upon one's listeners. These definitions and this basically positive view of rhetoric as an aid to effective expression will be the basis for the discussion in the next chapter, which will show that Lucretius did employ rhetoric in that he observed and selected "the available

---

[5] *Ars Rhetorica* 1354a (on rhetoric and dialectic and 1355b25 on the definition of rhetoric as "δύναμις περὶ ἕκαστον τοῦ θεωρῆσαι τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν"). I have quoted the translation by W. Rhys Roberts (New York rep. 1954, with an introduction by Friedrich Solmsen). The Greek text is from the edition by W. D. Ross (Oxford 1965).

Aristotle's remarks in 1355a22-1355b7 also are significant for one formulating a positive view of rhetoric, and one should take note of the philosopher's warning in 1355b6-7. On the form and purpose of rhetorical arguments, see especially 1355a3 ff. and 1356b ff.

A useful summary of Aristotle's views on rhetoric (with reference to specific passages in the *Ars Rhetorica*) is provided by Everett Lee Hunt in "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians" (*Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*, ed. Raymond F. Howes, Ithaca 1961, 54 ff., esp. 58-67); cf. Kennedy, 87-91.

[6] I 2, 2, ed. Friedrich Marx, ed. ster. cor. Winfried Trillitzsch (Teubner 1964). See also Cicero, *De inventione* I 1, 1-5, 6.

means of persuasion," which range from straightforward explanations to the emotional use of elements drawn from the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, and that he was interested in obtaining the agreement of the listeners to whom he was expounding a mixture of Epicurean doctrine and philosophical commonplaces.[7]

Any study of rhetoric and the diatribe in Lucretius, of course, faces the problem of the contradiction caused by the assumed Epicurean distrust of rhetoric and the poet's employment of rhetorical elements in his exposition of Epicurean doctrine. Concerning Epicurus' own opinions, for example, Quintilian (II 17, 15; H. Usener, *Epicurea*, 109) comments, "nam de Epicuro, qui disciplinas omnes fugit, nihil miror," a remark which reminds us of Epicurus' statement (Diogenes Laertius X 6; Usener, 362) urging a young man to flee from all Παιδείαν. The Greek philosopher also is said to have stated that the wise man eschews "ῥητορεύσειν καλῶς" (Diogenes Laertius X 118; Usener, 330, fr. 565).[8] Public speaking does not seem to have been totally forbidden to

---

[7] We should note here that Lucretius' readers actually may be referred to as listeners, since ancient literature was read aloud. This fact has obvious importance when one wishes to gauge the impact of various rhetorical figures and devices which depend upon sound for their effectiveness. David West's study of imagery in Lucretius (*The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*, Edinburgh 1969) rightly stresses the value of reading the poem aloud in order to gain a proper understanding of "the relationship between sound and sense..." (13; see also 115 ff. on sound). On reading aloud in antiquity, cf. Kennedy, 4 ff.; Josef Balogh, " 'Voces Paginarum', Beiträge zur Geschichte des lauten Lesens und Schreibens," *Philologus* 82 (N.F. 36), 1927, 84-109 and 202-240.

Concerning the readers for whom Lucretius would have been writing, cf. Pierre Grimal, "Lucrèce et son public," *Revue des Études Latines* 41 (1963), 91-100; A. M. Guillemin, *Le public et la vie litteraire à Rome* (Collection d'Études latines publiée par la Société des Études Latines 13, Paris 1937); B. Farrington, "Form and Purpose in the De Rerum Natura," in *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley, 19-34 (on Memmius). Despite the dedication to Memmius, we may not assume that Lucretius was interested in reaching only one reader. We should not forget, however, that Lucretius' *immediate* audience would have been composed of men whose cultural and educational background was similar to that of the poet and who could be expected to recognize and appreciate the literary allusions and rhetorical devices which Lucretius uses. In this group would be found men such as, for example, Cicero. Whether the poet himself hoped for an eventually wider circle of readers is a matter for speculation, as is the question of whether Lucretius expected his poem to "convert" his readers to Epicureanism.

[8] C. Joachim Classen, "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," *TAPA* 99 (1968), 111, quotes this remark by Epicurus. I have followed Classen's arrangement in my discussion of Epicurus and rhetoric.

Epicureans, however, for Epicurus stated that the wise man would take part in litigation, but would not deliver a panegyrical oration.[9] Further, according to Philodemus, Epicurus and his distinguished followers Metrodorus and Hermarchus acknowledged the fact that sophistic or epideictic oratory was an art,[10] thereby perhaps revealing an attitude not totally inimical toward rhetoric as a whole. Epicurus' main interest with regard to forms of expression, in fact, seems to have been in "... adequacy of expression and clarity of style (Diog. Laert. 10.13), i.e., virtues of style which were taught by rhetorical theory", and this interest seems to indicate that the philosopher's quarrel was not with rhetoric *per se*, but rather with its abuse.[11] The fact that his *Letter to Menoeceus* is written in a style which employs various rhetorical devices is an additional sign that the founder of Epicureanism saw some value in the art of persuasion, especially for works intended to reach an audience outside of the Epicurean school.[12]

---

[9] Cf. Harry M. Hubell, "Isocrates and the Epicureans," *CP* 11 (1916), 418, who cites Epicurus' remarks found in Diogenes Laertius X 121 (Usener, 330 and 332, fr. 563, 566, and 576). See also *Epicurus, the Extant Remains*, ed. Cyril Bailey (Oxford 1926, rep. Hildesheim 1970), 166-167.

[10] Cf. Harry M. Hubbell, *The Rhetorica of Philodemus, Translation and Commentary* (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 23, 1920), 256 and 567 (cited hereafter as Hubbell, *Rhetorica*). See also *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*, ed. Siegfried Sudhaus (Teubner 1893), III (Supplement), 8, col. VII; Cicero, *Academica Posteriora* I 5, who observes that the Epicureans Amafinius and Rabirius think that "nullam denique artem esse nec dicendi nec disserendi...". On the Ciceronian remark, see Classen, 113, and on the Epicureans and epideictic, see D'Alton, 155; A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio, The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers* (Amsterdam 1963), I, 202 and II, 426, note 15.

[11] Classen, 111.

[12] Hermann Usener (*Epicurea*, Teubner 1887, xlii), states, "nempe multos hodieque latet, quantum discrimen inter duo sermonis pedestris genera intercedat, quae ex Aristotelis tempore a scriptoribus graecis non paucis simul coli videmus: eos dico libros quos publice edebant ut ab hominibus elegantioribus legerentur, et eos quos sibi suisque philosophi maxime scribebant, quos ὑπομνήματα Graeci, Romani commentarios dixerunt." Cf. D'Alton, 159-160, for the Epicurean attitude toward rhetoric, and especially 160, where he writes regarding Epicurus, "in his own style he aimed especially at perspicuity, and made no pretence of elegance or ornateness, though Theon [Progym. III 71; Usener, 89] charged him with straining at times after rhythmical effects such as were affected by Hegesias and the Asianist orators."

Concerning rhetoric in Epicurus, see also Classen, 112, note 52 (for bibliography); Cesare Brescia, *Ricerche sulla lingua e sullo stile di Epicuro* (Collana di studi greci XXVI, Napoli 1955), 80-84; W. Schmid, "Epikur," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962), 710 ff.; Schrijvers, 326-330.

Further, we should not forget that Epicurus, as Usener has noted (xlii), was the pupil of Nausiphanes (Diogenes Laertius X 14), whose interest in rhetoric is well-known,[13] and that the younger philosopher may have been proficient in the art as a result of that association. Thus, it would seem that Epicurus' "alleged hostility towards rhetoric has to be modified. . ." (Classen, 111), and that we cannot use Epicurean distrust of the skill as an excuse for disregarding the influence of oratory upon Lucretius, or for claiming that the poet necessarily violated basic Epicurean precepts whenever he utilized a device or figure belonging to the rhetorical tradition. In addition, the poet's employment of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe with its very rhetorical style need not be considered an un-Epicurean activity, since at least one other Epicurean, Philodemus, also was influenced by the genre, and since Lucretius, like Epicurus in his *Letter to Menoeceus*, wanted to reach an audience outside of the Epicurean school and therefore chose an effective means of presenting that philosophy in a popularized form.

Lucretius' use of this popularized rhetorical form will be discussed in chapter II of the present study. Before commencing that investigation, however, we must define the term "diatribe" and delineate its major characteristics. The best definition is that given by Hermann Throm, who has stated that diatribes are "nichts anderes als ethische, besonders paränetische Theseis" (*Die Thesis*, Rhetorische Studien 17, Paderborn 1932; 191). Throm's definition captures the essentially hybrid nature of the genre which delivered popularized philosophical messages within an oration. To Throm's description, however, should be added the comment of Eduard Norden (*Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I, Leipzig 1909; 129) that the diatribe is a dialogue in the form of a declamation, for the diatribe seems to have taken over the interlocutor of the philosophical dialogue, reducing him to an impersonal figure, and the resulting genre is a lecture or *thesis* into which dialogue could be introduced through the assumption of an imaginary adversary or interlocutor (identified only by φησί) whom the speaker answers.[14] The use of direct address to the audience and of

[13] G. M. A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (London 1965), 133. Cf. also D'Alton, 157, note 7, and H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin 1898), 43 ff.

[14] Cf. E. J. Kenney (ed.), *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Book III* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge 1971), 18 (cited hereafter as Kenney, *Lucretius III*); R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt u.*

personifications provided the speaker with additional means of employing dialogue within his lecture, but these figures, of course, are not necessarily derived from the dialogue.[15] Additional characteristics of the genre in its final form include a frequently polemical tone, often expressed through that mixture of humor and seriousness known as τὸ σπουδαιογέλοιον,[16] in which the speaker exposes the vices and follies of mankind, the use of parataxis and of rather short sentences (cf. Norden, 129), and the employment of various popular devices such as parodies or quotations of poetry, anecdotes, apothegms, fables, antitheses, character sketches (cf. Fiske, 186), comparisons, and such rhetorical figures and tropes as would appeal to the general listener. The resulting "mixture of genres in prose" is indeed "a motley compilation" (Van Rooy, 34), but it also is a form whose influence reached even the didactic poetry of Lucretius.

The use of the term "diatribe" to denote this "mixture" certainly is problematical, since scholars have doubted the existence of a separate genre known as "the diatribe". Helmut Rahn, for example, has stated that the diatribe is not an "einheitliche Literaturform," and that "sie verbindet sich nur mit anderen literarischen

---

die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Forschungen zur Religion u. Kultur des Alten u. Neuen Test. 13, Göttingen 1910), 10 ff.; Ernst G. Schmidt, "Diatribai," *Der kleine Pauly* II (Stuttgart 1967), 1577-1578 (see especially his remarks on Throm). W. Capelle, "Diatribe," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1957), 992, thinks that the diatribe's interlocutor is derived from rhetoric and not from the Platonic dialogue.

[15] The general characteristics of the diatribe as delineated in the present study are based upon Bultmann, 10-46; Capelle, 990-997; André Oltramare, *Les origines de la diatribe romaine* (Lausanne 1926), 9 ff; Schmidt, 1577-1578; Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (Berlin 1907), 100 (cf. C. A. van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden 1966), 109 and 116); Paul Wendland, *Philo und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Berlin 1895), 1; Barbara P. Wallach, *A History of the Diatribe from its Origin up to the First Century B.C. and a Study of the Influence of the Genre upon Lucretius III 830-1094* (Dissertation University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1974), 14 ff. (cited hereafter as dissertation). See also chapter II, footnote 131, below.

[16] Cf. G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace, A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7, Madison 1920), 186 and *passim*; Mary A. Grant, *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable, The Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 21, Madison 1924); L. Radermacher, *Weinen und Lachen* (Wien 1947), 87-141. The recent study *The Use of Spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature* by Lawrence Giangrande (The Hague 1972) may safely be ignored (see my review in *AJP* 96 (1975) 211-214).

Formen als etwas erlebnishaft 'Diatribenartiges'." [17] While we might, indeed, challenge the validity of the term, however, a study of the remnants of Bion and Teles, of Philodemus' *De ira*, and of the parody found in Horace *Sermones* II, 3, when taken in conjunction with an investigation of Musonius Rufus and Epictetus, should convince us of the existence of a genre representing a popularization of the rhetorical and philosophical *thesis*.[18] That Lucretius was familiar with this genre is proved by his imitation of Bion in III 931 ff. and by his use of the major traits of the diatribe in III 830-1094 (see chapter II of the present study). When the poet employs traits and a style congenial with the Cynic-Stoic genre, we may say that he is writing in the diatribal style, and by the term "diatribal" we simply mean "diatribe-like" or "diatribe-influenced". Lucretius *technically* cannot be said to have written "a diatribe" in book III or elsewhere, but he must be credited with writing one or more "diatribes in poetic form", a possibly subtle distinction, but one which stresses the fact that the poet has incorporated *a prose form* within his epic and adapted that form by placing it in meter and using appropriate poetic diction ("broken" occasionally by the insertion of words such as *baratre* or *stulte*) so that it does not violate the rules of the genre into which it is inserted.[19] Thus, Lucretius' usage approaches the formula provided by Rahn (see above) in that the diatribe has been taken up into another literary form compatible with it, i.e. the didactic epic, which can be considered historically related to the homiletic tendencies of the diatribe (cf. Hesiod's admonitions).

---

[17] *Morphologie der antiken Literatur, eine Einführung* (Darmstadt 1969), 156.

[18] Regarding the problems involved in the use of the term "diatribe", cf. Otto Halbauer, *De diatribis Epicteti* (Dissertation Leipzig 1911), 3-11 (cf. Schmidt, 1578); Wallach, dissertation, 3-18. Early examples of the diatribe are provided by the fragments of Bion and Teles in *Teletis Reliquiae*, ed. Otto Hense (Teubner 2nd. ed. 1909, rep. Hildesheim 1969). Philodemus' *De ira* and *De morte* provide evidence for the influence of the diatribal style upon at least one Epicurean (cf. my dissertation, 117-141).

On Musonius, see A. C. van Geytenbeek, *Musunius Rufus and Greek Diatribe*, tr. B. L. Hijmans, Jr. (Wijsgerige Teksten en Studies 8, Assen rev. ed. 1963). Epictetus is discussed by Bultmann, *passim*. For Bion and Horace, see Richard Heinze, *De Horatio Bionis imitatore* (Dissertation Bonn 1889); Hans Herter, "Zur ersten Satire des Horace," *Rheinisches Museum* N.S. 94 (1951), 1-41; Wallach, dissertation, 189-225.

[19] Since it seems rather pedantic to refer constantly to the "diatribe in poetic form" in Lucretius III 830-1094, for the sake of convenience I use the term *diatribe* in Chapter II of the present study, fully aware of the distinction which I have made here.

We should not be surprised to detect the influence of the diatribe and of other rhetorical elements in the *De rerum natura,* for as a result of his own reading and basic education, Lucretius must have been thoroughly versed in the application of figures, in theories of style and arrangement, and in the use of devices such as character sketches and anecdotes which can enliven a writer's style if they are not abused.[20] The ease with which the poet employs figures, common topics, and the rhetorical *status* (cf. Classen, 107) and his apparent familiarity with the type of theory contained in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (cf. V 1-5 and *Rhet. ad. Her.* IV 43, 55) and in Cicero's *De inventione* are strong indications of study and thorough practice. Further, Lucretius' knowledge of the rhetorical plain, middle, and grand styles may have helped him to recognize the effectiveness of variety (cf. Classen, 92) in obtaining and maintaining the interest of an audience, and therefore the poet occasionally combined with the high epic style of much of his poem the mixed style and traits of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, thereby creating an effective amalgam which placed special emphasis upon the Epicurean ethical doctrine that accompanied his explanation of the physical world.[21] In addition, as E. J. Kenney has observed (*Lucretius III,* 15), "by this brilliant combinatory stroke Lucretius not only produced a profoundly original poem; he also laid the foundations of a tradition of satirical writing that has flourished down to modern times."

---

[20] Concerning Lucretius' background, cf. Antonio Traglia, *Sulla formazione spirituale di Lucrezio* (Roma 1948), 33-155; E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne* ser. IV, 23 (1970), 369.

The type of education which Lucretius probably received can be deduced from the accounts of Roman education compiled by Aubrey Gwynn, *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian* (Oxford 1926), 29 ff.; M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London 1971), 11-85, and *Rhetoric at Rome, A Historical Survey* (London 1953), 15 ff.; H. I Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity,* tr. George Lamb (New York, Mentor Books ed. 1964), 358-368.

See also Georg Reichel, *Quaestiones Progymnasmaticae* (Dissertation Leipzig 1909), for the standard series of exercises used in the rhetorical schools. Cf. Kennedy, 270.

[21] Cf. A. S. Cox, "Lucretius and his Message, a Study in the Prologues of the De Rerum Natura," *Greece and Rome* 18 (1971), 1 ff.; B. P. Wallach, "Lucretius and the Diatribe: De rerum natura II. 1-61", *Festschrift für Luitpold Wallach, Gesellschaft-Kultur-Literatur: Rezeption und Originalität im Wachsen einer europäischen Literatur und Geistigkeit,* ed. Professor Karl Bosl (Stuttgart, 1975).

See also Kenney, *Lucretius III,* 14-16 on the didactic *epos* and the three forms of style.

Unfortunately, the influence of rhetoric and the diatribal style on the work of Lucretius never has been thoroughly explored. Kenney, whose introductory remarks in his edition of Lucretius' third book provided a starting impetus for the present study, has given a general survey of the diatribal style (see 17-18) and has indicated the probable effects of the Cynic-Stoic genre upon Lucretius (19-20 and passim in his commentary). Prior to Kenney, André Oltramare, whose work on the Roman diatribe (*Les origines de la diatribe romaine*, Lausanne 1926) still is valuable, dealt with the diatribe in Lucretius, although, as Kenney notes (19, note 1), his treatment of the poet "is unfortunately inadequate." Oltramare's pioneering efforts have been followed by Paul Vallette's brief article "Lucrèce et la diatribe" (*Revue des Études Anciennes* 42 (1940), 532-541), Bruno Lavagnini's "Motivi diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale" (*Athenaeum*, N.S. 25 (1947), 83-88) and the two penetrating articles by Gian-Biagio Conte," "Υψος e diatriba nello stile di Lucrezio (De Rer. Nat. II 1-61)" (*Maia* 18(1966), 338-368), and "Il 'trionfo della morte' e la galleria dei grandi trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024-1053" (*Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 37 (1965), 114-132).[22] With the exception of Conte and Kenney, however, no one has conducted a reasonably thorough investigation of the influence of the diatribal style upon large portions of the *De rerum natura*. The study of rhetoric in Lucretius also had been largely neglected[23] before C. Joachim Classen's important "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius" (*TAPA* 99 (1968). 77-118) and the recent valuable book *Horror ac divina voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce* (Amsterdam 1970) by P. H. Schrijvers. The work of both of these scholars is a beginning, but more remains to be done in the area of rhetoric in the *De rerum natura*.

---

[22] One should note here that Karl Büchner, in "Über den Aufbau von Beweisreihen im Lukrez," (*Philologus* 92 (1937), 82), refers to the conclusion of book III as "eine Predigt im Stil der Diatribe." See also Ettore Bignone, *Storia della letteratura latina* (Firenze 1945), II, 268.

[23] The main exceptions are J. Woltjer, "Studia Lucretiana," *Mnemosyne* N.S. 24 (1896), 66-68 (cf. Classen, 106), and E. K. Rand, "La composition rhétorique du troisième livre de Lucrèce," *Revue de Philologie* ser. 3, 8 (1934) 243-66 (cf. Classen, 96, for cirticism). The bibliographies in Kenney (246) and Boyancé (329 ff.) and the footnotes in Kenney and in Classen are valuable sources of information concerning studies of rhetoric and the diatribe in Lucretius.

CHAPTER TWO

BOOK III, 830-1094: THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH

In no section of the *De rerum natura* is the influence of the diatribe more apparent than in the concluding section of book III. The themes, arguments, and stylistic devices all indicate that Lucretius must have been familiar with the Cynic-Stoic genre and that he knew the work of Bion of Borysthenes, to whom the development of the diatribe as a genre probably is due.[1] In order to explore thoroughly the influence of rhetoric and the diatribe upon the end of book III and the relationship of the passage to Bion or at least to his style, the following discussion will investigate the rhetorical and diatribal traits found within III 830-1094, and then will draw conclusions concerning the entire diatribe in poetic form. Further, since the relationship between this section and consolation literature has been investigated carefully by Traudel Stork in her dissertation *Nil igitur mors est ad nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuches und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur* (Bonn 1970), the present study will deal with that aspect of the conclusion of the third book only when some relationship between the diatribe and consolation literature must be clarified.

Lucretius begins his diatribe with a statement that is at once the conclusion of his previous arguments (cf. Schrijvers, 151), the premise of the lines which follow immediately (832-869), and the basic theme of the diatribe, occurring, as Ernout and Robin have observed, "comme une sorte de refrain dans toute cette fin." [2] The poet states (830-831),

> Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum,
> quandoquidem natura animi mortalis habetur,

---

[1] On Bion, cf. Hense, xliv ff., lviii ff., xciii ff., and passim; Fiske, 178-192; D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.* (London 1937), 62 ff.; Wallach, dissertation, 37-54. See also chapter I,note 18 above.

[2] Alfred Ernout and Léon Robin, *Lucrèce, Commentaire exégétique et critique* (Paris 1925, 2nd. ed. 1962), II 123-124 (hereafter cited as Ernout and Robin).

and then supports his contention with the following remarks (832-869):

et velut anteacto nil tempore sensimus aegri,
ad confligendum venientibus undique Poenis,
omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu
horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris,
in dubioque fuere utrorum ad regna cadendum
omnibus humanis esset terraque marique,
sic, ubi non erimus, cum corporis atque animai
discidium fuerit quibus e sumus uniter apti,
scilicet haud nobis quicquam, qui non erimus tum,
accidere omnino poterit sensumque movere,
non si terra mari miscebitur et mare caelo.
et si iam nostro sentit de corpore postquam
distractast animi natura animaeque potestas,
nil tamen est ad nos qui comptu coniugioque
corporis atque animae consistimus uniter apti.
nec, si materiem nostram collegerit aetas
post obitum rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est
atque iterum nobis fuerint data lumina vitae,
pertineat quicquam tamen ad nos id quoque factum,
interrupta semel cum sit repetentia nostri.
et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
qui fuimus, <nil> iam de illis nos adficit angor.
nam cum respicias immensi temporis omne
praeteritum spatium, tum motus materiai
multimodis quam sint, facile hoc accredere possis,
semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta
haec eadem, quibus e nunc nos sumus, ante fuisse.
nec memori tamen id quimus reprehendere mente;
inter enim iectast vitai pausa vageque
deerrarunt passim motus ab sensibus omnes.
debet enim, misere si forte aegreque futurumst,
ipse quoque esse in eo tum tempore, cui male possit
accidere. id quoniam mors eximit, esseque probet
illum cui possint incommoda conciliari,
scire licet nobis nil esse in morte timendum
nec miserum fieri qui non est posse neque hilum
differre an nullo fuerit iam tempore natus,
mortalem vitam mors cum immortalis ademit.

The theme expressed in lines 830-831 is Epicurean, for Lucretius has rendered closely Epicurus' remark "ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ· τὸ δ' ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς" (*Kuriai Doxai* II; Usener, 71; cf. *Letter to Menoeceus* 124 ff.; cf. Bailey, 1135; Ernout and Robin, II, 124). It is interesting to note

that Quintilian (V 14, 12) includes within his discussion of the epicheireme the following Latin version of this statement as an example of an argument in which the conclusion is "non par intentioni sed vim habens parem":

> Mors nihil ad nos, nam quod est dissolutum,
> sensu caret; quod autem sensu caret, nihil ad nos.[3]

Lucretius also has created a type of rhetorical argument based upon his master's saying, and he incorporates within his argument proofs which are Epicurean in origin and depend upon acceptance of the material that has been presented in the preceding lines of book III. In this argument, line 830 serves as the proposition (*propositio*), 831 is the reason or *ratio*, and then in 832-864 appears a series of "proofs" (*rationis confirmatio*), based primarily on analogy, which attempt to demonstrate the truth of the proposition and reason.[4] The first of these proofs comprises 832-842 and

---

[3] Professor L. Wallach kindly has called my attention to the references to this Epicurean doctrine listed by J. H. Waszink in his edition of Tertullian's *De Anima* (Amsterdam 1947), 459 ff. (on Tert. 42). Cf. Cicero, *De finibus* II 31, 100 (ed. Th. Schiche, Teubner 1969), who renders the statement as "mortem nihil ad nos pertinere. quod enim dissolutum sit, id esse sine sensu, quod autem sine sensu sit, id nihil ad nos pertinere omnino."

See also Conte, "Il trionfo . . .", 115, note 2, who observes that, "la stessa semplicità sintattica dell' espressione, parimenti ridotta all' essenziale e articolata con uguale enfasi ritmica . . . si ritrova in molti altri versi epifonematici di Lucrezio." The term *epiphomema* is defined in Quintilian (VIII 5, 11; cf. Conte) as "rei narratae vel probatae summa acclamatio." The epiphonemic nature of Lucretius' lines 830-831 is another indication that one may take them as a conclusion of what precedes them, as well as an introduction to what follows.

830-831 possibly could stand alone as an enthymeme; cf. Demetrius II 109, on the enthymeme as an "ἐπιφωνήματος εἶδος" (Conte, 115, cites Demetrius on the epiphoneme.). For a recent discussion of the enthymeme see W. M. A. Grimaldi, *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 25, Wiesbaden 1972).

[4] I am using the terms for the sections of a rhetorical argument provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* II 18, 28, which lists five parts of a rhetorical argument or epicheireme, namely "propositionem, rationem, rationis confirmationem, exornationem, conplexionem," and then gives the following description of their functions:

> Propositio est per quam ostendimus summatim quid sit quod probari volumus. Ratio est quae causam demonstrat verum esse id quod intendimus, brevi subiectione. Rationis confirmatio est ea quae pluribus argumentis corroborat breviter expositam rationem. Exornatio est qua utimur rei honestandae et conlocupletandae causa, confirmata argumentatione. Conplexio est quae concludit breviter, colligens partes argumentationis.

informs the reader that just as he felt no effects from the Punic war, which occurred before his birth, so he will not be affected by anything that happens when he is dead,

> . . . cum corporis atque animai
> discidium fuerit quibus e sumus uniter apti.

Obviously, this is a proof based on analogy, the standard Epicurean form of reasoning.[5] The poet has employed as the basis for his

---

Also included are examples of bad or faulty arguments (II 20, 31 ff.), which need not be quoted here. The edition (with translation) by Harry Caplan (Loeb, Cambridge 1954) will be the source for all quotations from, and references to, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* I also have consulted the standard Teubner edition (ed. Friedrich Marx, ed. ster. corr. by Winfried Trillitzsch, 1964).

Some of the arguments of Lucretius which will be examined in the present study could possibly be analyzed in terms of the schemes for rhetorical arguments provided by Cicero in *De inventione* I 34, 57-41, 77, if one uses a model based upon one premise with proof attached. I am using the scheme presented by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, however, since it seems to be closer to Lucretius' method, and since it allows for a more detailed analysis. On the epicheireme in these two rhetorical treatises, see Wilhelm Kroll, "Das Epicheirema," (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, *Sitzungsberichte* 216, 2, 1936). See also Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (München 1960), I, sections 348 ff., esp. 371; Josef Martin, *Antike Rhetorik, Technik und Methode* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II, 3, 1974), 103 and 105-106.

One should not assume that the poet is presenting his case in a loose fashion or that he, as an Epicurean, is so scornful of logic that he employs no set method of arguing (cf. J. M. Rist, *Epicurus. An Introduction*, Cambridge 1972; 14). As in other cases where he has used a scheme resembling the epicheireme, Lucretius here seems to have adapted the basic formula to suit his own needs and style.

[5] Concerning the Epicurean method, cf. P. H. and E. A. DeLacy (eds.). *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference, A Study in Ancient Empiricism* (Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Assoc.; Philadelphia 1941), 14 ff., 129 ff., 138 ff., and the text of Philodemus' treatise. As the DeLacys note (14), "according to the Epicurean method we infer the nature of unperceived objects by analogy with the objects of our own experience." Further, "an inference from signs is valid if it is inconceivable that the sign exists when the thing signified does not." Certainly, no one can offer "evidence to the contrary" (cf. *Ibid.* 144) to destroy Lucretius' argument which, therefore, must be held valid by Epicurean standards.

For Epicurean arguments, see also J. L. Stocks, "Epicurean Induction," *Mind* 34 (1925), 185-203.

One should add here that arguments from analogy are quite compatible with rhetoric. Cf. DeLacy and DeLacy, 127 ff. on Aristotle and Nausiphanes; Lausberg, section 358 ff., espec. 367-371.

On the use of analogy by Lucretius, see also Classen, 87; Karl Büchner, *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez* (Dissertation Leipzig 1936), 27.

inference the undeniable fact, established by common sense as much as by perception, that, as he expresses it,

> . . . anteacto nil tempore sensimus aegri,
> ad confligendum venientibus undique Poenis.

From this sign Lucretius infers that just as an event happening before one's birth has no effect upon one, so events after one's death also have no effect.

Various scholars have noticed the correspondences between this Lucretian proof and the comment in the Pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Axiochus* (365d) "ὡς οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς Δράκοντος ἢ Κλεισθένους πολιτείας οὐδὲν περὶ σὲ κακὸν ἦν — ἀρχὴν γὰρ οὐκ ἦς, περὶ ὃν ἂν ἦν — οὕτως οὐδὲ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν γενήσεται· σὺ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσῃ περὶ ὃν ἔσται."[6] E. J. Kenney, for example, states that Lucretius "uses an Epicurean argument ([Plat.] *Axioch.* 365d) in a Roman setting." One should not assume, however, that the similarities between Lucretius and the *Axiochus* provide evidence for the Roman poet's use of the dialogue.[7] On the contrary, one can build a strong case for Lucretian independence.

First of all, as Ernout and Robin have observed (II 127), "ce raisonnement par analogie qui de l'état passé déduit l'état futur est fréquent chez les anciens." The employment of well-known historical personages or events as examples also is a common practice and can be traced back to the rhetorical schools, as well as to Greek literature prior to the *Axiochus*.[8] Lucretius' reference

---

[6] Cf. Richard Heinze, ed., *Lucretius, Buch III* (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern, Leipzig 1897), 162 (cited hereafter as Heinze, *Lucretius III*); Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 193; Stork, 32.

The text of the *Axiochus* is from the Budé edition of Plato's apocryphal dialogues, ed. Joseph Souilhé (Paris 1962, vol. 13 part 3 of *Platon, Oeuvres Complètes*).

[7] Cf. Stork, 33, who observes, "damit soll nun allerdings nicht gesagt sein, dass Lukrez den ps.-platonischen Axiochus als Quelle benutzt hat. Es lassen sich zwar auffallend weitgehende Übereinstimmungen feststellen, aber eben doch nur an einer Stelle, die einen Topos enthält."

[8] Regarding the date of the dialogue, cf. Souilhé, 123 ff.; Martin Meister, *De Axiocho dialogo* (Dissertation Breslau 1915), 2 ff. and *passim* (cf. Stork, 224); E. H. Blakeney (ed.), *The Axiochus, On Death and Immortality, A Platonic Dialogue* (with trans. and notes; London 1937), 33; C. Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia critica* (Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie 9, 1, 1886), 14 ff.; Otto Immisch, *Philologische Studien zu Plato*, I, Axiochus (Leipzig 1896), 1 ff.; A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work* (London 7th ed. rep. 1966), 550-553. I have listed all of these studies because of the obvious importance of the date of

to the Punic war could, in fact, result from his training in the composition of narrative exercises based upon historical incidents or in the use of historical *exempla*, which would have provided a ready source for illustrative material.[9] At any rate, the poet, in choosing to mention the Punic war, obviously thought that the reference would be comprehensible to his audience, even though the events mentioned happened long before its time, and he, therefore, relied upon a common educational background which included the use of historical examples in compositional exercises.

An additional argument against the influence of the *Axiochus* upon the *De rerum natura* 830 ff. is provided by the specific nature of the historical examples used. While the *Axiochus* mentions two famous statesmen, Dracon and Kleisthenes, the Roman poem does not refer to men in its "corresponding" section (but cf. 1024 ff.), but, instead, presents an event which was traumatic for the Romans, and which, therefore, serves to emphasize Lucretius' point (concerning total insensibility before birth and after death) in a way which references to historical figures never could. The selection of the Punic war as an illustration presumably was Lucretius' own, but the impetus for that choice may have come from a Greek source. In his diatribe Περὶ ἀπαθείας Teles, for example, answers

---

the dialogue and also because discussions of the date involve discussions of the content and sources.

For historical examples in Greek literature, cf., for instance, Aristotle: *Nicomachean Ethics* 1100a10 (Solon), 1117a25 (Argives); Plato: *Gorgias* 503c (Themistocles; cf. 515d), and 483e (Xerxes); *Symposium*, 209d (Lycurgus; Solon). Especially important, of course, are Aristotle's remarks (*Ars Rhetorica* 1393a 25 ff.) on examples. Cf. Kennedy, 37, on historical examples in Homer.

On the use of historical examples in the rhetorical schools, see Gwynn, 67 and 104 ff.; M. L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome* (hereafter cited as Clarke, *Rhetoric*), 15 and 57-58; Richard Kohl, *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis* (*Rhetorische Studien* 4, Paderborn 1915), *passim*.

[9] S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool 1969), 22-23, notes the references to Hannibal and to the Punic War in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and comments that "debates on Hannibal's dilemmas, which later aroused the ridicule of Juvenal, were evidently popular in the Sullan age, e.g., 'Hannibal deliberates whether, on being summoned to return from Italy to Carthage, he should remain in Italy, or return home, or proceed to Egypt and seize Alexandria' (III, 2, 2)."

Collections of anecdotes involving historical figures were, of course, available in Lucretius' era; cf. Fiske, 159 ff.

See also Stork, 33-34, who mentions the use of historical topics in consolation literature, and cites Cicero *Tusculan Disputations* I 90 and I 91.

his interlocutor's remark, "ἀλλ' οὐκέτι ἔσται," with the following observations (ed. Hense, 61.2-4):

> Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μυριοστὸν ἔτος, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς προπάππους σου. σὺ δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τούτῳ οὐκ ἄχθῃ, ὅτι δὲ εἰς ὕστερον οὐκ ἔσται, δυσχεραίνεις.[10]

The combination of an argument based upon a temporal analogy and a reference to a devastating war bears an obvious similarity to Lucretius' method of proof, although the poet has created a striking description which contrasts strongly with Teles' straightforward assertion. Possibly Lucretius knew the work of Teles or perhaps the diatribist drew his analogy from a lecture by Bion with which the poet, who elsewhere reveals the influence of Bion (see below on III 931 ff.). was familiar and which was his actual source.

A third possibility is suggested by the following lines from Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* I 37, 90 (ed. M. Pohlenz, Teubner rep. ed. 1965; cf. Stork, 33):

> . . . is plane perspiciet inter Hippocentaurum, qui numquam fuerit, et regem Agamemnonem nihil interesse, nec pluris nunc facere M. Camillum hoc civile bellum, quam ego vivo illo fecerim Romam captam. Cur igitur et Camillus doleret, si haec post trecentos et quinquaginta fere annos eventura putaret, et ego doleam, si ad decem milia annorum gentem aliquam urbe nostra potituram putem? Quia tanta caritas patriae est, ut eam non sensu nostro, sed salute ipsius metiamur.

In this passage the analogy and the type of illustration employed resemble the method of Teles and of Lucretius in the sections already cited. Since book I of the *Tusculans* was influenced by Posidonius, who, in turn, made use of the Περὶ πένθους of Crantor,[11] we could assume that similarities between Cicero and Lucretius

[10] Concerning this reference, see Rudolf Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* (Zetemata 18, München 1958), 79.

[11] Ernout and Robin, II, 125-126; cf. Meister, 96 ff.; Buresch, 95 ff.; Pohlenz (*Tusculans*), 31-32; Georges Fohlen (ed.), *Ciceron, Tusculanes*, with tr. by Jules Humbert (Collection des Universités de France, Paris 3rd. ed. 1964), x-xi.

See also Woldemar Görler, *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Philosophie* (Heidelberg, 1974), 20-26, and especially 19, where he warns, "in der neueren Forschung wird fast ausnahmslos die Meinung vertreten, dass es eine einheitliche Quelle für das erste Tusculanenbuch nicht gibt und dass inbesondere die Verbindung der drei an sich voneinander unabhängigen Gedankengänge von Cicero selbst stammt." Cf. the works listed by Görler in his footnote 2 on 20, and especially A. J. Kleijwegt, "Philosophischer Gehalt und persönliche Stellungnahme in Tusc. 1, 9-81," *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 19 (1966), 359-388.

are indicative either of a common source, that is Posidonius (cf. Meister, 98 note 1), or of the use of Crantor by the independent sources of the two Roman authors. Not to be ignored, of course, is the possible influence of Lucretius on Cicero (cf. Stork, 34), and we also should not lose sight of the commonplace nature of the basic analogy involved, which could have been drawn, by either or both writers, from some form of consolatory literature or, as the quotation from Teles shows, from a diatribe.[12]

The theme found in the Lucretian and Ciceronian passages, as well as in the *Axiochus*, concerns the lack of sensation after death and would seem to be definitely of Epicurean origin, if it were not for the appearance of a similar idea in Teles. As developed by Lucretius, however, the topic becomes specifically Epicurean with the introduction of the notion of a "discidium" of soul and body. Cicero's remark (I 37, 90) that ". . . animo et corpore consumpto totoque animante deleto et facto interitu universo illud animal, quod fuerit, factum esse nihil" also could be considered to be of Epicurean origin because of its emphasis on total destruction, although one does not find the mention of the unity of body and soul which appears in Lucretius (839). In Teles the reason for lack of sensation after death is not given beyond the simple "οὐκ ἔσται," a factor which seems to connect the diatribist to no school, although Epicureanism with its idea of non-survival was in existence before the time of Teles.[13] The Greek writer may have been reflecting Cynic views (cf. Cicero *Tusculans* I 43, 104; Stork, 57-58) or perhaps only popular opinion concerning death, such as that reflected in the epitaph (5th century B.C.) "οὐ γὰρ [ἔτ]ι

---

[12] The commonplace nature of the type of analogy involved is well-illustrated by the examples found in Kassel, 79, who mentions, for instance, Philodemus *De Morte* 24, 5. It is quite unlikely that Philodemus, Teles, Lucretius, Cicero, and the author of the *Axiochus* all needed to use the same source.

One also should note here that the Cynic-Stoic diatribe seems to have influenced consolation literature. Cf. Kassel, 12-17; Jean Hani (ed.), *Plutarque, Consolation à Apollonius, Texte et traduction avec introduction et commentaire* (Études et Commentaires 78, Paris 1972), 12 and 53.

[13] For the date of Teles, cf. Alexander Fuks, "Non-Phylarchean Tradition of the Program of Agis IV," *Classical Quarterly* 56 (1962), 118-120; Olimpio Musso, "Telete e la battaglia di Efeso," *La Parola del Passato* 82 (1962), 129-131. I wish to thank Professor Hans Herter of Bonn, who kindly called my attention to these studies.

ζῶσαν ἐσοφσόμεθα." [14] On the basis of the available evidence we cannot identify a definite source for Teles (although Bion frequently is his source) [15] or for either Roman author, nor can we ascertain the extent of possible Lucretian influence on Cicero. Either or both of the later writers could have added a commonplace analogy to a well-known Epicurean theme or could have adapted the concept of insensibility or non-survival after death, probably mentioned in other literature (such as Teles), to Epicurean doctrine. In other words, the possible sources are numerous, and we cannot attempt to be more specific, when we are dealing with a commonplace theme and method, for which one definite source may never have existed.

The above discussion has been intended as an illustration of the difficulties involved in tracing either a *topos* or a common method of proof to any one source and also as an indication of the impossibility of proving the direct influence of the *Axiochus* upon the *De rerum natura*. As one final and rather decisive argument against such influence, we may cite here the probability that the dialogue as a whole or in part at least seems to have been an "anti-Epicurean polemic," intended to destroy rather than to advance the views of that sect.[16] It seems absurd, then, to assume that Lucretius would have used an anti-Epicurean dialogue for an argument that he may have been able to find in a work of his own school. Possibly Lucretius and the author of the *Axiochus* had access to an Epicurean work on death, a treatise or perhaps the Epicurean equivalent of a *consolatio*, which supplied the argument for both writers,[17] and

[14] The epitaph is quoted from Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, Illinois 1962), 77.

[15] On Bion as a source for Teles, cf. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism*, 85 (Hereafter cited as Dudley, *Cynicism*); Hense, xliv ff. (see also the index of Bionean passages in Hense's first edition of Teles).

[16] Cf. Taylor, 551-552; Immisch, 24 ff. and 63 ff.; Blakeney, 33.

[17] Cf. Buresch, 60 ff.; Kassel, 29-32; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 32. See also Souilhé, 129, concerning the eclectic nature of the dialogue.

Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 172, writes that Heinze postulates as a source for Lucretius a consolation that was Epicurean or "interprétée par Lucrèce dans un sens épicurien." The French scholar adds, however, "mais l'hypothèse d'une source unique n'est pas vraisemblable pour une partie à la fois si peu dogmatique et d'un accent si personnel." Lucretius' diatribe may be undogmatic in its use of diatribal themes and traits, but its basic message and the arguments which occur in passages a little less dependent upon the diatribe (such as 830-869) indicate that the poet was presenting orthodox Epicurean doctrines concerning the soul and that he, therefore, had an Epicurean source (or sources) in addition to diatribal ones.

which would have been a likely source for the poet. The similarities between the two works are insufficient, however, to allow us to attempt any reconstruction of an Epicurean source or of any combination of an Epicurean work plus commonplaces from the diatribe or consolatory literature.

The exact identity of Lucretius' source, however, is of less importance than the fact that the poet has presented an Epicurean argument and has used an Epicurean method to do so. Further, the use of analogy is not incompatible with rhetorical argumentation, for, as Aristotle already noted, rhetorical arguments are constructed upon "signs and examples", since rhetoric "... is not concerned with truth, but only with conjecture of the probable or persuasive...".[18]

One might assume that Lucretius uses analogy because he is an Epicurean, but it is interesting to note that, although that school allegedly disparaged rhetoric, its methodology of reasoning has much in common with rhetorical theory.

After presenting his first proof, based upon analogy, Lucretius adds a comment which is related to the idea that one feels nothing after soul and body have separated. The poet writes (843-846),

> et si iam nostro sentit de corpore postquam
> distractast animi natura animaeque potestas,
> nil tamen est ad nos qui comptu coniugioque
> corporis atque animae consistimus uniter apti.

While the first proof conceivably could be accepted by a non-Epicurean who would be persuaded by the commonsensical nature of the analogy, this second one depends heavily upon acceptance of the concept that sensation cannot exist if soul and body are separated[19] (cf. III 323-358). The poet is relying, of course, upon the strength of the arguments which he has presented earlier within book III, and, therefore, he does not elaborate on the point which

---

[18] DeLacy and DeLacy, 127, in reference to Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* I 1355a 17 and 1359b 30-33.

Cf. Quintilian V 14, 14 (ed. Radermacher, 2nd. ed. ed. V. Buchheit), who states, "epichirema autem nullo differt a syllogismos, nisi quod illi et plures habent species et vera colligunt veris, epichirematis frequentior circa credibilia est usus. Nam si contingeret semper controversa confessis probare, vix esset in hoc genere usus oratoris."

[19] Stork, 36, comments that, "die Argumentation, auf die sich Lukrez hier stützt, ist nur gültig unter der Voraussetzung, dass die persönliche Existenz in der Verbindung von Körper und Seele besteht."

he presents within lines 843-846 and which he connects to lines 830-842 through the repetition of *nil est* (cf. 830) and *corporis . . . uniter* (cf. 839), an obviously didactic device. Further, in his claim that one will not be affected even if soul and mind retain sensation after death, since one no longer exists once soul and body have separated, Lucretius not only is reiterating the Epicurean doctrine of the unity of soul and body but also seems to be attempting to forestall the objections of those who still believe that the soul has a life of its own.[20] Perhaps the poet has in mind the imaginary opponent which he uses elsewhere (cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 165), whose objections he must give and then answer, although in this case no actual opponent has been set up.

After this concise proof Lucretius includes a third one which is expanded by a brief elaboration and which attempts to lay to rest another source of fear. The poet claims that even if (847-848)

> . . . materiem nostram collegerit aetas
> post obitum rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est,

and life should return,[21] nevertheless such an occurrence would not matter (*nec . . . pertineat*) (851)

> interrupta semel cum sit repetentia nostri.

In lines 850-851 one sees again the emphasis on the idea that death means dissolution, the destruction of personality and consciousness, and that, therefore, whatever happens to the atoms of one's soul after one dies can be of no concern to one who no longer has anything to do with those atoms. This concept, which is repeated in slightly different forms in 830-831, 838-839, 845-846, and 850-851, is the element which connects all of the proofs and reiterates in a didactic fashion the proposition and reason which the poet wishes to demonstrate. In order to illustrate the aspect of this repeated concept

---

[20] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 196, thinks that 843-846 have been ". . . admitted . . . for the sake of argument. . .". Cf. Bailey, 1136, whose translation of *si iam* as "to suppose for a moment that" gives these lines a force which supports the idea of an imaginary opponent.

[21] As Kenney notes (*Lucretius III*, 196), "this contingency is not admitted, like its predecessor, for the sake of argument: Epicurus seems to have held that it was not impossible, and at 856 L. finds it easily credible. In its original, cyclic, guise the idea was Stoic." Cf. Bailey, 1134, who mentions the Stoic concept of rebirth or *palingenesia* and observes that "the idea was apparently accepted by Epicurus, though he naturally substituted for the Stoic idea of a regular cycle his own conception of a fortuitous recombination of the component atoms."

with which he deals in lines 847-851 the poet employs an analogy based upon past and present and relies upon the criterion of "lack of proof to the contrary" (see footnote 5). He brings in the present first in lines 852-853, stating,

> et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
> qui fuimus, <nil> iam de illis nos adficit angor,

and thereby uses the fact that one is not concerned now about any previous existence as a sign that one similarly will feel no concern in the future should those atoms which now compose one's soul reunite at some time after one's death to form a person identical to one's present self. In his next eight lines the poet develops the idea expressed in lines 852-853 by bringing in the past, as he did in 832 ff., and observing that one easily may believe that (857-858)

> semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta
> haec eadem, quibus e nunc nos sumus, ante fuisse.

Lucretius then reiterates the idea previously expressed in 851, when he explains (859-861),

> nec memoii tamen id quimus reprehendere mente;
> inter enim iectast vitai pausa vageque
> deerrarunt passim motus ab sensibus omnes.

Since no one, according to Epicurean doctrine and common experience, actually can recall a former existence, there is no evidence available to contradict Lucretius' remark in 859, and therefore his analogy drawn from past and present must be considered valid by the standards of Epicurus' *Canonice.*[22]

At the end of this analogy the poet makes the remark (862-864),

> debet enim, misere si forte aegreque futurumst,
> ipse quoque esse in eo tum tempore, cui male possit
> accidere . . ,

which concludes his third proof, but which also expresses an idea that is implicit in each of the three proofs.[23] This comment then

[22] Cf. footnote 5 and F. Merbach, *De Epicuri canonica* (Dissertation Leipzig 1909); Rist, 15 ff.

[23] The development of this analogy, which expands the point presented in 850-851, might be classed as an *exornatio*, since it does serve "rei honestandae et conlocupletandae causa, confirmata argumentatione" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* II 18, 28).

Bailey, who briefly discusses the proofs in this section (1133-1135) writes that "the concluding lines 862-9 go back in thought to the main idea of the paragraph *nil mors est ad nos* and might well follow directly on 842."

acts as a natural transition into the conclusion of the entire argument (864-869), where Lucretius presents what must be considered a summary or *conplexio* (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* II 18, 28) making explicit the points which the poet wants his audience to understand from his argument. Thus, Lucretius stresses the idea of nothingness or the destruction of conciousness which comes with death, when he informs his readers (866-869).

scire licet nobis nil esse in morte timendum
nec miserum fieri qui non est posse neque hilum
differre an nullo fuerit iam tempore natus,
mortalem vitam mors cum immortalis ademit.

As the above analysis and summary have indicated, the argument in lines 830-869 has a coherent structure and follows a pattern which may reflect the type of rhetorical argument described by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (see footnote 4 of this chapter). Lucretius' arrangement of his proofs also may reflect his rhetorical training, since the poet certainly has put his most convincing and most carefully illustrated ones first and last, almost burying the one which he admits only "for the sake of argument" (see footnote 20).[24] Further, one must note that this argument obviously has been arranged artistically by the poet with the two analogies supplementing and balancing each other and with connecting threads provided by the frequent repetitions of the idea that nothing after death concerns the individual who has died. There seems to be no justification, then, for Kenney's remarks (*Lucretius III,* 195) that lines 843-61 "... form a digression or parenthesis within the paragraph ..." and that "they follow naturally on what precedes (840 *qui non erimus* ~ 843-4) and are relevant to the theme *mors nil est ad nos*; but little attempt is made to facilitate the transition back to the main argument at 862."

One cannot ignore the possibility that the argument which Lucretius uses here is based directly upon an Epicurean source and that both the form of the argument and its contents, with the exception of the references to Roman history, depend upon the arrangement followed by that source. Certainly the premise is a translation of Epicurus and the proofs do employ Epicurean

[24] For the arrangement of arguments in a speech, cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* III 10, 18. See also Classen, 84, on Lucretius' general practices in arranging his proofs; Karl Büchner, "Über den Aufbau von Beweisreihen im Lukrez," *Philologus* 92 (1937), 68-82.

methodology. The fact that Lucretius follows a similar scheme in several arguments within his *prooemia* might be an argument in favor of the poet's independence of style, although one still cannot be sure that the order of proofs followed by the poet here was not a standard procedure among Epicureans. Further, since Lucretius does not argue always in the same way, sometimes using rhetorical arguments (in some of his *prooemia*) [25] and sometimes using "mixed hypothetical syllogisms in destructive form . . ." (Classen, 84), one might argue that the arguments which resemble rhetorical ones are more representative of his own work than are the syllogisms, or one might argue in favor of a plurality of sources. Obviously such problems cannot be solved conclusively, since Lucretius' primary source or sources have been lost. One can only state that Lucretius could have drawn his basic proofs for this argument from an Epicurean source, and then, on the basis of his rhetorical training, he could have constructed an argument following a rhetorical pattern and have embellished his proofs to make them more convincing and artistic.

Another possible indication of rhetorical influence upon the poet is the fact that lines 830-869 are placed at the end of the arguments expressed in book III and serve to reinforce the points that the soul is mortal (cf. 417 ff.), that body and soul must be united for a man to exist (cf. 344-349), that a man is conscious of nothing once soul and body have been separated (cf. 558-579), that one retains no memory of a former existence (cf. 670 ff.), and that nothing evil can happen to one after death (a conclusion based upon all of the points just mentioned), all of which points, as the lines in parentheses above indicate, Lucretius has mentioned in some form elsewhere in book III. One might assume that just as in the *prooemia* to his books Lucretius employed the common devices of the rhetorical *exordium*, so in lines 830-1094, which form an obviously carefully constructed ending for book III, he has made use of some of the

---

[25] See III 41 ff. and V 1 ff. The present writer intends to investigate in a later study the possible use of rhetorical arguments elsewhere in Lucretius.

The poet obviously is not following the style of Epicurus in the *Letter to Menoeceus* 124-125, where the basic premise concerning death appears. Cf. David Konstan, *Some Aspects of Epicurean Psychology* (Philosophia Antiqua 25; Leiden 1973), 17, note 37, on the derivation of the type of argument presented by Epicurus (*Ibid.*) from Aristotle *De interpretatione* XII 21a34-21b5.

elements of a rhetorical conclusion.[26] The fact that this passage contains a type of summary of the most important points made by the poet, then, would allow one to class it as the *enumeratio* of the conclusion "per quam colligimus et commonemus quibus de rebus verba fecerimus, breviter, ut renovetur, non redintegretur oratio" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II 30, 47). Such an assumption does not represent an attempt to make book III fit into the mold of a judicial speech, but rather only indicates the probable effect of rhetorical theory upon literature other than orations, and the adaptation and use of rhetorical devices by authors employing such genres as the didactic poem or the philosophical essay.[27] Thus, just as the author of a philosophical treatise might use an arrangement resembling that of a speech in which an *exordium, narratio, divisio, confirmatio, confutatio,* and *conclusio* all appear, or use one including only some of these divisions, and do so under the influence of the rhetoric in which he was trained, so might Lucretius have used an introduction, proof, refutation, and conclusion (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* I 3, 4 ff. on these terms) simply because, as a result of his training in rhetorical composition

---

[26] On traits of the *exordium* in the *prooemium* to book I, see Classen, 105 ff. Cf. Rand, who calls these lines the *Peroratio,* and Kenney, *Lucretius III,* 30, who calls them the conclusion.

[27] Cf. Classen, 96, who comments that "while E. K. Rand's attempt to force the familiar five parts of a *logos* on the third book must be regarded as a failure, it is generally agreed that not only are the prooems carefully planned and executed, but also the final sections of each book are given special prominence and are composed with a view to the preceding book, to the following book, and to the poem as a whole."

The diatribe which concludes Lucretius' third book is a dramatic, and at the same time a didactic, epilogue. With the possible exception of 830-869, which include an enumeration, this section cannot be made to conform to the standard model of a conclusion given within rhetorical textbooks concerned primarily with judicial and deliberative oratory. The use of a rhetorical form to conclude a book of poetry is a special case, but one might look to the conclusion of book I of Cicero's *Tusculans* for an example of a literary epilogue (see I 47-49), which does draw together some of the points made in the first disputation, and does use a commonplace "ab auctoritate" (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* II 30, 48), but which obviously differs from the typical conclusion of a judicial or deliberative speech. Possibly Lucretius' use of a diatribe to end his third book bears some relation to the type of conclusions found in consolation literature.

For the possible influence of rhetorical treatises on Lucretius' separate *prooemia,* cf. Michel Ruch, *Le préambule dans les oeuvres philosophiques de Cicéron, Essai sur la genèse et l'art du dialogue* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fasc. 136, Paris 1958), 332 ff.; Schrijvers, 170.

or as the result of his use of a source which followed a similar basic scheme, such an arrangement seemed to be the most natural and was almost a matter of habit. One must not forget, of course, that, even though they may be intended to be the *enumeratio* of the poet's conclusion, 830-869 also are transitional in that they lead from the expository section of book three into the diatribal section in lines 870 ff., and introductory, in that they set the theme for the following section, i.e.,

Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum,

and begin to set its tone through the irony which appears in lines 832-842 (see below at footnote 30).

Before we proceed now to a discussion of the next group of lines (870-893) in the text under consideration, we must note a few other elements appearing within this introductory passage (830-869). Especially striking is the proverb (line 842; cf. Bailey, 1136) which concludes the first proof, when the poet writes that once soul and body have separated nothing can happen to a man or cause sensation in him,

non si terra mari miscebitur et mare caelo.

This remark reminds one of an *adynaton* or impossibility, a common device in which a poet "...pour représenter un fait ou une action comme impossibles, absurdes ou invraisemblables, les met en rapport avec une ou plusieurs impossibilités naturelles." [28] Ac-

---

[28] Ernest Dutoit, *Le thème de l'adynaton dans la poésie antique* (thesis Fribourg; published Paris 1936), ix. Dutoit does not mention this line.
Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 195, writes that Lucretius is referring "to the Epicurean doctrine which he is to discuss at 5.235-415," although his readers (as he obviously intended) were bound to think of the proverbial saying quoted below after footnote 29. Further, according to Kenney, "what men speak of lightly is, whether they like it or not, going to happen. The implication is assisted by the syntax: after *non si* one would expect pres. subj., as at, e.g., Virg. *A*. 12. 203-5...; here the future *miscebitur* shows that this is a statement of fact, not a remote eventuality."
The true *adynata* in Lucretius are expressed either with the subjunctive or with a present or perfect indicative form (cf. those listed by Dutoit) expressing inability.
Concerning the Epicurean idea of the cosmos, see Friedrich Solmsen, "Epicurus on the Growth and Decline of the Cosmos," in *Kleine Schriften*, I (Hildesheim 1968), 484-501.
Cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 164, who mentions the Greek proverb quoted in the present study after footnote 29 and observes, "hier natürlich nicht in jenem sprichwörtlichen Sinne, sondern = 'und wenn die ganze Welt ein-

cording to the views of those philosophies which believed in the eventual destruction of the world (cf. Stoics and *ekpyrosis*) and of the Epicureans who believed in the eventual dissolution of the present earth into its atoms, which then could form new worlds, the proverb found in line 842, of course, would not be an *adynaton* but an eventual reality. Lucretius also does not seem to have intended his remark as an *adynaton*, for he uses the device elsewhere (cf. I 161-166; III 5-8; III 622-623; III 748-753; III 784-786; Dutoit, 62-65) in a negative fashion to indicate a true impossibility, often forming a *reductio ad absurdum* of a view which he opposes, while in this instance he wishes to indicate a possibility or even an eventual occurrence which, however strong it may be, cannot affect a man who has died.

The poet probably inserted the proverbial statement because it was familiar to his audience and therefore would convey his message easily and convincingly (cf. Aristotle *Ars Rhetorica* 1395a 8-11). That the proverb was familiar seems to be indicated by Cicero's remark (*De finibus* III 19, 64), "quoniamque illa vox inhumana et scelerata ducitur eorum, qui negant se recusare quo minus ipsis mortuis terrarum omnium deflagratio consequatur—quod vulgari quodam versu Graeco pronuntiari solet—, certe verum est etiam iis, qui aliquando futuri sint, esse propter ipsos consulendum." [29] The Greek verse to which Cicero refers may have been similar to, or identical with, the following tragic fragment (Frag. Tr. Gr. adesp. 513; quoted here from Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 164):

> ἐμοῦ θανόντος γαῖα μιχθήτω πυρί, οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, τἀμὰ γὰρ καλῶς ἔχει.

Since Lucretius obviously knew the proverb, like Cicero he may have known this verse, and he may have intended his statement to be an imitation of it. Especially important in the tragic fragment just quoted are the words οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, since they express precisely the attitude which the poet wants his listeners to have, that is, that nothing matters to them after death. If any of Lucretius' readers knew the Greek verse, he, of course, could supply the

stürzt.' " Heinze cites Juvenal II 25, ". . . wobei der Anklang an L. zufällig sein wird." In the Juvenal passage the proverb has the force of an *adynaton* and is expressed with a present subjunctive.

[29] A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, gesammelt und erklärt* (Hildesheim rep. 1971), 345, records this remark; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 164.

οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, when he heard the Lucretian line concerning earth, sea, and sky. Since one does not know the source of this quotation, however, one can make no accurate judgments concerning the possibility that Lucretius intended his remark to mirror it rather than the simple proverb, "γῇ οὐρανὸν συνάπτειν, καὶ γῇ θάλασσαν ἀναμιγνύναι: ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα ὀργιζομένων ἀμφότερα" (quoted from Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 164).

At any rate, the sentiment expressed in line 842 is in keeping with the general tone of lines 832-842 in which the poet ironically reveals the fleeting nature of even so great a turmoil as the Punic War [30] and seems to belittle the fears of his audience by showing it that not even the destruction of the world could disturb one who has died. The irony is augmented by the imitation in line 835,

> horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris,

of the remark by Ennius (*Annales*, 306, Warmington; cited by Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 194),

> Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu.

As Kenney has noted (193), "the vocabulary and phrasing of 833-7. . ." seem to indicate that the poet is "imitating, or even parodying the high epic style. . .," and one may add that the probability that these lines are a parody is heightened by the ironic tone just mentioned.[31] Lucretius creates an ironic hyperbole, substituting the whole world for Africa, and literally overwhelms his listener with the contrast between a world "turned upside down" and the sublime unconcern coming with death. The irony, the use of a proverb, the employment of a rhetorical argument,

---

[30] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 193, summarizes the irony of 832-842 with the remark, "these events were, when they occurred, world-shaking and so presented themselves to a great national poet— but what are they to us now ?"

[31] Concerning irony as a part of some parodies, cf. F. J. Lelièvre, "The Basis of Ancient Parody," *Greece and Rome* ser. 2, 1 (1954), 72. On definitions of parody, cf. Lelièvre, 66-75; Jean-Pierre Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines à Juvénal* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fascicule Deux-Cent-Sixième, Paris 1966), 9-12; Gilbert Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire* (Princeton 1962; paperback ed. 1972), 69 ff. Lucretius' parody in these lines is one involving changes in a specific line from another author and also one involving general stylistic imitation (cf. Lelièvre, 66-69). Kenney observes concerning lines 834-835 that "in his adaptation of what was probably a well-known passage L. overdoes things slightly for his own satirical purpose. . ." (*Lucretius III*, 194).

and the imitation or parodying of poetry, and especially of well-known poetry, are, of course, common traits of the diatribal style [32] and are strong indications that the poet has begun to use that style already in these lines which form the introduction to the more obviously diatribal passages which follow.

Further, lines 830-869 are not devoid of rhetorical figures, which serve as additional indications of their careful construction and oratorical nature. The hyperbole or *superlatio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 33, 44) in 832-837 already has been noted above, and, with the exception of the frequent alliteration and assonance (cf., for instance, 830, 832, 835, 837, 842, 848, etc.), is the most obvious figure in this section. Also noteworthy is the homoeoptoton, i.e. *similiter cadens* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 20, 28), evident in the *Poenis* and *oris* of 833 and 835, which ornaments a section made additionally rhetorical through the use of the hyperbaton (*transgressio*; *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 32, 44) forming a chiastic word order in line 834,

> omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu.

Another chiastic arrangement appears in 842 with *terra mari* corresponding to *mare caelo*.[33] The position of *miscebitur* in this same line provides an instance of the figure *coniunctio* which connects the "superiores partes orationis. . . et inferiores" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 27, 38), and which, as a figure appropriate for "brevity", is especially suitable for a proverbial expression.

To the chiastic lines already cited may be added 857,

> semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta,

in which the chiasmus is produced through the use of hyperbaton (*transgressio*) separating the nouns from their modifiers, and 869,

> mortalem vitam mors cum immortalis ademit,

where an *abba* scheme is evident.[34] Line 869 also contains an obvious *oxymoron* in the phrase *mors immortalis* and an antithesis

---

[32] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 193, notes that ". . . the suggestion of irony is characteristic of the diatribe. . .". He does not, however, connect the parody and the proverb with the diatribal style in this passage. On hyperbole, cf. Schrijvers, 291-292.

[33] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 195, sees a crescendo in this line.

[34] On schemes for chiasmus, see Leonid Arbusow, *Colores Rhetorici, Eine Auswahl rhetorischer Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten*, 2nd ed. by Helmut Peter (Göttingen 1963), 81.

drawn between immortal death and mortal life (cf. Bailey, 1139 on Amphis). Further, Lucretius may have intended his use of *mortalem* and *immortalis* to be a wordplay or *adnominatio*, as well as an antithesis, formed along the lines of the example "emit morte immortalitatem" which survives in Quintilian (IX 3, 71).[35] One additional figure worthy of mention appears in 852-853,

> et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
> qui fuimus, <nil> iam de illis nos adficit angor,

in which a form of anaphora is created by the position of *nunc nil* and *nil iam* and augmented by the multiple alliteration of n's.[36] All of the embellishments which have been noted here help to emphasize the poet's message in 830-869 and thus have a didactic, as well as an ornamental, purpose.

When he has concluded his introductory rhetorical argument concerning death (830-869), Lucretius commences the major portion of his poetic diatribe with a passage dealing with men who worry about the disposal of their bodies after death. The poet informs his audience (870-875),

> Proinde ubi se videas hominem indignarier ipsum,
> post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto
> aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum,
> scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse
> caecum aliquem cordi stimulum, quamvis neget ipse
> credere se quemquam sibi sensum in morte futurum.

After this statement which serves as the proposition which he wants to prove, Lucretius supplies a reason (*ratio*) for his views, when he adds (876-878),

> non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde,
> nec radicitus e vita se tollit et eicit,
> sed facit esse sui quiddam super inscius ipse.

---

[35] Cf. Lausberg, I, 329, section 648.6 regarding *adnominatio* and Quintilian. Perhaps the phrase "immortal death" is meant to be slightly sarcastic, or the poet may only be stressing the inevitability and permanence of death. On the oxymoron in line 869 see W. A. Merill, ed., *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (New York 1907).

[36] The use of alliteration and other figures based on sound is discussed in Rosamund E. Deutsch, *The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius* (thesis Bryn Mawr 1939).

The *nil* in line 853 is, of course, an emendation, but a plausible one. On the usefulness of repetition, cf. F. F. Abbott, "The Use of Repetition in Latin to Secure Emphasis, Intensity, and Distinctness of Impression," *Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 67-87.

A *rationis confirmatio* (879-887) and an ironic *exornatio* [37] (888-893) then are provided by the following lines:

vivus enim sibi cum proponit quisque futurum,
corpus uti volucres lacerent in morte feraeque,
ipse sui miseret; neque enim se dividit illim
nec removet satis a proiecto corpore et illum
se fingit sensuque suo contaminat adstans.
hinc indignatur se mortalem esse creatum
nec videt in vera nullum fore morte alium se
qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum
stansque iacentem <se> lacerari urive dolere.
nam si in morte malumst malis morsuque ferarum
tractari, non invenio qui non sit acerbum
ignibus impositum calidis torrescere flammis
aut in melle situm suffocari atque rigere
frigore, cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi,
urgerive superne obtritum pondere terrae.

As the divisions mentioned above indicate, Lucretius once again has constructed an argument which follows the basic outline of a rhetorical argument and which, as a rhetorical argument must (see footnote 18), relies on probability and observations which an audience can grasp quickly. The poet has not included a conclusion, apparently because he prefers to close his remarks in 870-893 with a sarcastic expression of the foolishness of concern for one's burial, an expression which is far more emphatic in its irony than any formal conclusion would be. The present writer cannot agree with Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 199), who observes that "in his evident pleasure in the keen sarcasms with which he rounds off the passage he [i.e., Lucretius] apparently fails to notice that he has passed to discussing a commonplace which, though related, is different from that with which he began." Lucretius, rather, has returned to his starting point (cf. Bailey, 1140) in this "embellishment," for, just as he began with references to concern for the fate of one's body after death, so he concludes with ridicule of that concern, presented as a *reductio ad absurdum*. One should add here that the fact that the poet has mentioned the cause of a man's preoccupation with the destruction of his body does not

[37] I once again have used the terms and divisions provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (see footnote 4 above). I have classed 888-893 as the *exornatio* only to differentiate them from the confirmation (*rationis confirmatio*) and to indicate that they represent the poet's elaboration of the idea expressed by the "proof". Cf. Bailey, 1140, on the "confusing" nature of this argument.

mean that he no longer is concerned with the form which that fear takes and with the need to indicate the folly of the manifestation of that fear as well as its cause. Lucretius, therefore, demonstrates the latter and then ridicules the former in order to make sure that his audience understands at least something of the foolishness involved in the attitude which he illustrates.

The method which Lucretius follows in these lines is, of course, diatribal as well as rhetorical.[38] In lines 870-893 one finds traces of an imaginary opponent whom the poet has set up to represent an opinion which he wishes to refute. Lucretius has created a brief character sketch (*characterismos*) which depicts the state of mind of the man who pities himself because

post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto
aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum.

Within this sketch the poet inserts references to his character's remarks. Line 874, for example, concludes with the phrase, "quamvis neget ipse credere," while in 876 Lucretius comments,

non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde.

The ***neget*** and the ***non dat quod promittit*** should be considered the equivalent of the diatribal φησί (cf. Chapter I, at footnote 14) which was used, according to Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 18), to indicate "... an anonymous butt, whose objections, invariably futile, were prefaced merely by a φησί." Unlike the diatribal practice, however, the Lucretian usage often does not create an opponent to raise objections, but rather depicts a person who, as in this instance, illustrates a point of view or a specific folly which the poet wishes to present and then dismiss with ridicule, for the edification of his audience and also, as Kenney has suggested (see footnote 38), "to enlist the emotional sympathies of his readers," who, one may add, must be made to feel somewhat superior to the "fool" whom the poet describes.[39]

---

[38] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 199, states that "this paragraph marks the point at which the diatribe-satirist... takes control of the argument: a comparison with the treatment of the same idea by the author of the ps.-Platonic *Axiochus* (365c) shows how L. uses rhetoric to enlist the emotional sympathies of his readers."

[39] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 18-19, observes that "... the intention of these sermons was to inculcate a few simple lessons of conduct in memorable terms, and the speaker concentrated on enlisting the sympathies of his audience, so that it should appear as clear to them as it did to him that those who did not agree with the point of view expressed were fools." Kenney does not notice the "interlocutor" or the character sketch in 870-893.

Through his character sketch in lines 870-893 Lucretius builds up a tone of *spoudaiogeloion*, intended to make the listener smile at the follies of the character described but also take seriously the poet's message concerning the cause of those follies. The culmination of the sketch is the "contemptuous enumeration" (Kenney's term; cf. *Lucretius III*, 202) in 888-893 where the poet remarks,

> nam si in morte malumst malis morsuque ferarum
> tractari, non invenio qui non sit acerbum
> ignibus impositum calidis torrescere flammis
> aut in melle situm suffocari atque rigere
> frigore, cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi,
> urgerive superne obtritum pondere terrae.

Despite the distasteful nature of the subject, the audience certainly must be moved to smiles or even laughter by Lucretius' vivid listing of equally foolish and unfounded fears. Kenney (202) cites as a parallel to this enumeration Bion's similar listing, which reads as follows (Teles, 31; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 169; Oltramare, 113):

> εἰ δὲ μὴ κρυφθείης, ἀλλὰ ἄταφος <ῥιφθείης>, τί τὸ δυσχερές; ἢ τί διαφέρει ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυθῆναι ἢ ὑπὸ κυνὸς καταβρωθῆναι ἢ ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ κοράκων ἢ κατορυχθέντα ὑπὸ σκωλήκων;

The series of rhetorical questions and the enumeration which goes along with them are typical of Bion's style, appearing, for example, in his *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* (Teles, 6-8), where the tone, as in this passage, is both scornful and polemical. Possibly Lucretius' enumeration was influenced by the practices of Bion or his imitators, since its tone of *spoudaiogeloion* and contempt is certainly diatribal. Lucretius obviously has improved upon Bion, if the passage quoted above is representative of the type of source which the Roman poet used, by representing the imagined discomforts of the corpse which, for instance, may be "suffocated" by honey or become stiff from the cold stone upon which it is lying. Such descriptions of the body's situation add humor and vividness which are almost lacking in Bion's sarcastic enumeration of the alternative fates awaiting one's body.

In addition to the other diatribal traits which have been noted there appear two imitations of Roman tragedy which may reflect the diatribe's habit of quoting or parodying poetry. Lucretius writes in lines 873-874, for example,

scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse
caecum aliquem cordi stimulum. . .,

probably imitating the following line from Ennius' tragedy *Andromache* (E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin,* I, fr. 112):[40]

nam neque irati neque blandi quicquam sincere
sonunt.

The excessive alliteration of "s's" employed by Lucretius may be intended to reflect the general style of Ennius, who is well known for his alliterations (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 12, 18), or possibly the Epicurean poet only wants to emphasize his own remarks concerning the man who worries about the fate of his body. Even if the alliteration is not intended as a parody of Ennius, the use of the phrase *sincerum sonere* probably represents an intentional reminiscence intended to stress the deceit of himself and of others involved in the self-pity of the fearful man, which differs from the deceit practiced by the angry or fawning men of Ennius' fragment only in that it partly deludes the practitioner as well as his listeners. A second and more obvious example of imitation occurs in 879-881, where the poet observes,

vivus enim sibi cum proponit quisque futurum,
corpus uti volucres lacerent in morte feraeque,
ipse sui miseret.

When he wrote these lines, Lucretius seems to have had in mind the following lines spoken by the ghost of Deiphilus to his mother Iliona in Pacuvius' *Iliona* (Warmington, II, fr. 205-210):[41]

Mater, te appello, tu quae curam somno suspenso levas
neque te mei miseret, surge et sepeli natum. . .
. . .priusquam ferae volucresque. . . .
neu reliquias quaeso meas sieris denudatis ossibus
per terram sanie delibutas foede divexarier.

The similarities between *ipse sui miseret* (Lucretius) and *te mei*

[40] Ernout and Robin, II, 134-135, record this parallel and cite Plato, *Theaetetus* 179d, as an example of an earlier usage of the same theme.
[41] Ernout and Robin, II, 136, refer to Lucretius' line 880 as "réminiscence évidente de l'*Iliona* de Pacuvius, où l'ombre de Polydore s'exprime ainsi (R^3 197. . .) . . ." and quote the lines from Pacuvius which appear in Warmington (*Remains of Old Latin,* Cambridge, Loeb ed. 1967), III, as fr. 205-210. This fragment is preserved by Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations* I 44, 106 (cf. Warmington, II, 238 and Ernout and Robin, II, 136), who comments, "non intelligo quid metuat, cum tam bonos septenarios fundat ad tibiam."

miseret (Pacuvius), and between the second line of the Lucretian passage and Pacuvius' *ferae volucresque* are obvious and provide strong evidence that Lucretius has at least imitated, and probably, in view of the general *spoudaiogeloion* of the passage, parodied the speech of Deiphilus. Undoubtedly the Epicurean poet could expect his immediate audience of educated Romans to recognize this imitation, especially since the Pacuvian scene involved the appearance of a ghost, generally a memorable occurrence, which, incidentally, was ridiculed later by Cicero (see footnote 41).

In his imitation of Pacuvius, Lucretius has remained close enough to his original to insure recognition of his source, and he seems to have depended upon his audience's knowledge of the tragic scene to give a special emphasis to the views which he is expressing in lines 879-881. The stress on *vivus* (879), for example, which is placed first in its line, takes on new significance when the listener recalls the speech of Deiphilus and notes that, unlike the dead Deiphilus, Lucretius' worried man is concerned while he is still alive. According to Epicurean views, of course, a man can be concerned about his own corpse only while he is alive, since his body and soul are separated and lose consciousness after death. The remarks in lines 885-887 also have an added significance for the listener who has recognized the Pacuvian imitation in lines 879-881. Lucretius here states that the man who worries about his corpse actually has not realized that

> . . . in vera nullum fore morte alium se
> qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum
> stansque iacentem <se> lacerari urive dolere.

The fact that Deiphilus in the tragic scene does precisely what Lucretius says cannot be done, that is, he watches and mourns the desecration of his body, cannot escape the attention of the audience and must clarify for them the thoughts of the fearful man whom the Epicurean poet is portraying. One must note that once again Lucretius has inserted *vivus* in order to make certain that his listeners understand that his character, unlike the legendary Deiphilus, is alive and imagining things which he never will witness. The basic effect produced by this parody, then, is the creation of a frame of reference for the listener through the use of allusions to a familiar scene in which those same actions that Lucretius' character imagines are depicted. The audience's memory of this scene allows

it to grasp quickly and remember the point which the Epicurean poet makes.[42]

The use of a parody in order to reinforce a point or only to hold the audience's attention is, of course, a diatribal trait, and, when taken in connection with the enumeration in lines 888-893, with the character sketch which comprises 870-893, with the use of an imaginary opponent, and with the tone of *spoudaiogeloion*, must prove that lines 870-893 have been composed within the diatribal style. Further, the facts that this parody is concerned with burial and was taken from a Roman tragedy may indicate direct influence from Bion upon the Epicurean poet. Within the same diatribe in which he enumerated the various fates which await a corpse (Teles, 31, 1 ff.; see above after footnote 39), if Teles' arrangement can be trusted, Bion included three quotations from Greek tragedy, each dealing in some way with burial. The first of these features Polyneices urging (30, 4 ff; from Euripides, *Phoen.* 1447 ff; cf. Hense),

> Θάψον δέ μ' ὦ τεκοῦσα καὶ σὺ σύγγονε
> ἐν γῇ πατρῴᾳ, καὶ πόλιν θυμουμένην
> παρηγορεῖτον, ὡς τοσόνδε γοῦν τύχω
> χθονὸς πατρῴας, κεὶ δόμους ἀπώλεσα.

The second quotation notes (Teles, 30, 10),

> καὶ γῆς φίλης ὄχθοισι κρυφθῆναι καλόν,

while the last one (Euripides, *Phoen.* 1451, cf. Hense; Teles, 31, 4) begs,

> συνάρμοσον δέ μου βλέφαρα τῇ σῇ χερί,
> μῆτερ.

The appeal to a mother, found in this third quotation, obviously bears a resemblance to the appeal of Deiphilus to his mother, found in the Pacuvian fragment which Lucretius parodies. The situation in the quotation in Bion, of course, seems to be a more normal one than that in the scene from the *Iliona*, especially since the closing of a dear one's eyes was a common motif in consolation

---

[42] The effect must be that of a comparison, only in this case, half of the comparison depends upon the audience's recollection of the scene from Pacuvius and is not set out explicitly.

Concerning Lucretius' audience, see chapter I, footnote 7. On Pacuvius as a school text, see Clarke, *Higher Education*, 20.

literature and apparently a common practice.[43] Since Lucretius may have been influenced in his enumeration in lines 888-893 by the similar enumeration found in Bion, it is not impossible that the Roman poet also was inspired by the diatribe writer's use of this quotation from the *Phoenissae* to make use of Deiphilus' appeal to his mother as described by Pacuvius. Even if this particular quotation did not influence him, Lucretius may have been influenced by the quotation of tragedy, and of other types of poetry, within this and other diatribes by Bion and his followers. Since he is writing in poetry rather than in prose, however, the Roman poet does not take over completely the diatribal method of quotation, but rather, as he did, for example, in his second *prooemium* (cf. II 24-28 and Odyssey VII 100), he may translate and make subtle alterations in Homer, or he may allude to or imitate Greek (cf. I 6-7) or Latin (cf. III 873) poetry, or, finally, as in these lines, he may create a parody or imitation intended to augment his surface description. One, of course, cannot prove that Lucretius was influenced by the diatribe in his use of imitations or parodies, but the presence of these in passages which contain other traits of the diatribal style must strengthen the probability, at least, if they do not indeed confirm the fact, that in such passages the poet was influenced by the Cynic-Stoic genre's didactic use of poetic quotations and parodies.

To the stylistic traits which have been mentioned and which connect III 870-893 to the diatribal tradition must be added those themes within this text which resemble diatribal topics. Lucretius' description of one's unburied corpse, first of all, seems to reflect the diatribal topic described by Oltramare (64, theme 91c) as, "il est stupide de *craindre de ne pas être enterré*," which is found, of course, in the sarcastic enumeration by Bion quoted above (see after footnote 39).[44] Even closer to the Roman poet's topic in these lines, however, is the following anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope which Cicero includes in his *Tusculan Disputations* (I 43, 104; cf. Stork, 57-58):

> Durior Diogenes et is quidem idem sentiens, sed ut Cynicus asperius, proiici se iussit inhumatum. Tum amici: Volucribusne

---

[43] Cf. José Esteve-Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, Untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz* (Dissertation Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, München 1962), 141, section I.

[44] Oltramare, 113, connects this topic with the Lucretian lines.

> et feris? Minime vero, inquit, sed bacillum propter me quo abigam ponitote. Qui poteris? illi, non enim senties. Quid igitur mihi ferarum laniatus oberit nihil sentienti?

The indifference expressed here by Diogenes is the attitude which Lucretius must want his audience to develop and which is lacking in the character type that the Roman poet describes. Lucretius possibly knew of this anecdote or at least of the Cynic attitude, and he may have had its theme in mind when he wrote lines 879-887 parodying Pacuvius and ridiculing the man who is concerned about the mangling of his corpse. Influence from this Cynic theme, indeed, may be the reason for the Roman poet's greater emphasis upon the mangling of the body than upon the other forms of disposition of the corpse, although, as Bailey suggests (1140), "the strongest fear is that of an unnatural treatment of the corpse," and therefore Lucretius dwells upon that fear as the one most in need of eradication.

There is a strong possibility, further, that the author of the *De rerum natura* used a source which dealt with the themes of burial and mangling and, which, in addition, quoted a passage from tragedy to illustrate that theme. The probability that Bion was Lucretius' source of inspiration has just been discussed above (see after footnote 42), but the facts that Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations* I 43-44, also deals with the topics of the mangling of a corpse and of the lack of bodily sensation after death [45] and that he embellishes his discussion with poetic quotations, and especially with the quotation from Pacuvius' *Iliona* which Lucretius parodies (see footnote 41), seem to indicate that Lucretius and Cicero had a common source, which, in view of the stylistic evidence, must have been a diatribe or a work influenced by a diatribe. Bion might have been this source, since, as was noted above, his quotation representing an appeal to a mother to close the eyes of her dying or dead son could have inspired Lucretius and also Cicero (or Cicero through Lucretius) to use the Pacuvian lines. Further, since Teles has preserved only fragments of Bion, one might advance the theory that the actual Bionean diatribe was longer and dealt in

[45] Stork, 58, writes that "aus Ciceros Abhandlung ergibt sich noch eine andere Beobachtung, und zwar der Hinweis auf die Beziehung der Konsolationsliteratur zur Popularphilosophie. In der Diogenes-Anekdote nämlich, 1, 104, wird in Inhalt und Formulierung mit Lukrez Vergleichbares ausgesprochen, volucribusne et feris ... ferarum laniatus ... nihil sentienti. Hinzu kommt eine Bemerkung Bions bei Teles p. 31, 1 ff. H." See also 59.

more detail with the various fears concerning nonburial, perhaps even including an anecdote or two.[46] All of this is speculation, of course, but, since Lucretius' treatment of his theme does have much in common with the work of Bion and of Cicero, one must assume that the poet is somehow connected with both, and that he has in common with Cicero either the use of Bion directly or the employment of a source which included elements taken from Bion, from the Cynic tradition upon which Bion himself drew, or from the imitators of the famous diatribe writer. As Ernout and Robin have observed (II, 125-126), however, "le premier livre des *Tusculanes* est imité de Posidonius, dans lequel Cicéron a trouvé des citations du Περὶ πένθους de l'académicien Crantor, contemporain d'Epicure, que peut-être d'ailleurs il connaissait lui-même directement".[47] Further, as will be mentioned again presently, Cicero also makes use of Chrysippus, citing him as a source for *Tusculans* I 45, 108 (cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 169 for this source). The use of these Stoics does not preclude the possibility that Cicero used Bion as well, but it is probable that the theme of nonburial and even the anecdotes that the Roman writer employs came from his Stoic sources and, perhaps, ultimately from Crantor.[48] Since Crantor and Bion were approximately contemporaries, one may assume that a theme such as nonburial and the mangling of the body might have been a common philosophical *topos* known to both men and that this *topos* and perhaps commonly known anecdotes concerning it could have been used by each. If this were the case, then Lucretius by using Bion and Cicero by using Posidonius, who used Crantor, could have included this same common topic within their own works without actually using the same source or sources. Such a hypothesis is only one explanation, and still does not explain

[46] The Bionean diatribe may have been entitled Περὶ ταφῆς; cf. Hense, cii-ciii, who cites Teles, 30, 1; cf. Stork, 187, footnote 201.

[47] See footnote 11 above and the discussion concerning the source of lines 830-842.

[48] On the sources of the *Tusculans*, cf. Buresch, 95 ff., who notes that books I and II stem partly from Crantor "quem secutus est Cicero in Consolatione," and partly from various sources "quos scripturus Consolationem tantummodo inspexerat (ut erat inter filiae mortem et scriptionis initium brevissimum temporis spatium)." Among the other sources Buresch includes Dicaearchus and Chrysippus, and he states that he intends to show "si et Crantoris et ipsius Consolationis locos passim per Tuscl. disp. libros I et III sparsos esse partim simplici enumeratione partim singulis quaestiunculis."

the use of Pacuvius by both Roman authors, although that use could be coincidental or could be the result of Lucretian influence upon Cicero. If one may take later *consolationes* such as Ps.-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium* as an example of the genre, of course, then the quotation of poetry must have been a common feature of that genre as well as of the diatribe, and Crantor's work, and subsequently Posidonius', could have employed poetic quotations which provided a model for Cicero, who substituted Roman poetry for the Greek. All of these possibilities have been mentioned to indicate the complicated nature of an attempt to track down the source of a theme which belongs to more than one philosophical school and to more than one genre and the need to rely on some test beyond that of thematic correspondence in order to show the relationship between Lucretius and the diatribe.

In addition to the theme concerning the necessity of avoiding concern for one's burial, one also may see within the enumeration of practices employed for the disposition of corpses (III 888-893) traces of the Cynic fondness for comparing ". . .entre eux les usages des divers peuples." [49] A common diatribal theme, as listed by Oltramare (46, theme 14a), for example, was the observation that "*les moeurs des peuples étrangers* sont l'indice que des actions condamnées par l'opinion doivent être considérées comme naturelles." The source for this theme is an account of some of the views of Diogenes of Sinope (Diogenes Laertius VI 73; cf. Oltramare, 46) in which the Cynic is said to have denied that ". . .ἀνόσιον εἶναι τὸ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων κρεῶν ἅψασθαι, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐθῶν." Bion may have dealt with foreign burial rites in his Περὶ ταφῆς (Teles, 30, 1 ff.), but none of the surviving fragments contains any evidence that he discussed topics other than the fear of nonburial or of burial in a foreign land or possibly also the fear of death. Comparisons drawn from foreign customs were not limited to the Cynics, however, for Cicero, in his *Tusculan Disputations* (I 45, 108), mentions burial customs in various foreign countries and then adds "permulta alia colligit Chrysippus, ut est in omni historia curiosus, sed ita taetra sunt quaedam, ut ea fugiat et reformidet oratio" (cited by Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 169; cf. SVF III, fr. 751 ff, and Ernout and Robin, II, 136). Lucretius' references to the devouring of the body by animals, to cremation, to em-

---

[49] Vallette, 536; cf. Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 172; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 202.

balming, and to inhumation (Bailey's terms, 1142) may reflect a source which delineated foreign practices (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, 137), but the Roman poet's purpose is not the drawing of comparisons between foreign and domestic customs, but rather the depicting of the foolishness of concern for the disposition of one's corpse. It is this emphasis on foolishness which seems to connect Lucretius' list with Bion's (Teles, 31, 1 ff.), which also ridicules the absurdity of worrying about burial and which mentions cremation and mangling by animals and birds. Possibly the Epicurean poet added to Bion's list his own information concerning embalming in honey, information drawn from a source such as Chrysippus, from common knowledge,[50] or from a now lost section of Bion's Περὶ ταφῆς. The practice described by the words "cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi" could refer to the familiar custom of laying a body in a sarcophagus or, as Bailey thinks (1142), could be connected with the process of embalming. Actually, with the possible exception of the embalming process, the forms of burial mentioned by Lucretius are common enough that the poet could have used Bion's method of enumeration and added all of these methods of burial without using another source. At any rate, whatever Lucretius' source or sources may have been, the method involved seems to be diatribal and may be derived from Bion or may, as Vallette thinks (536), be related to the Cynic fondness for comparing the customs of different countries.

---

[50] Cf. Varro, *Menippearum Reliquiae*, ed. Franz Buecheler, in *Petronii Saturae et Liber Priapeorum* (Berlin 6th ed. 1922), frag. 81 (cf. Bailey, 1142), "Quare Heraclides Ponticos plus sapit, qui praecepit ut comburerent, quam Democritus, qui ut in melle servarent. quem si vulgus secutus esset, peream si centum denariis calicem mulsi emere possemus." Since Varro was under the influence of Menippus, one might assume that this theme goes back through Menippus to the diatribal tradition and to a common theme ridiculing concern, of any kind, for the disposal of one's corpse. On the Varronian satire, see Eduard Norden, "In Varronis Saturas Menippeas observationes selectae", in *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (Berlin 1966), 31 ff. Concerning Varro and the diatribe, cf. Barbara P. McCarthy, "The Form of Varro's Menippean Satires," in *Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller*, ed. Rodney P. Robinson (The University of Missouri Studies 11, 1936), 95-107.

J. M. C. Toynbee discusses Roman burial practices in her *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, Ithaca 1971), 33-64 and *passim*.

Regarding the concept of "loci communes" see Alain Michel, "Eclectisme philosophique et lieux communs: à propos de la < <diatribe romaine> >," *Latomus* 70 (*Hommages à Jean Bayet*), 1964, 485-494.

Lucretius' themes, however, are not connected only with the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, for in his rhetorical argument (870-893) the poet has expressed views which have an Epicurean basis. These views include his reference to the concept of the loss of sensation which occurs with death (875), and the observation that the man who worries about his body after death does not realize that he has nothing to do with that body once he has died, and that he will be unaware of what happens to it (882-887). Further, as Bailey has noted (1139), the fear "that there will be a surviving 'self' which will identify itself with the corpse (881-2) and, as it were, stand by the corpse and watch its sufferings with pity. . ." was a common Epicurean theme, being found in Diogenes of Oenoanda (ed. Chilton, fr. 14), as well as in an Epicurean passage within the *Axiochus* (365c). The extant remarks of Epicurus do not include this theme of identification, but Diogenes Laertius (X 118), in his life of Epicurus, observes that the Epicureans think that the wise man is not concerned about his burial, and Epicurus, in his *Letter to Menoeceus* makes the following observation (125; Usener, 60-61):

> οὐθὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δεινὸν τῷ κατειληφότι γνησίως τὸ μηδὲν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῷ μὴ ζῆν δεινόν. ὥστε μάταιος ὁ λέγων δεδιέναι τὸν θάνατον οὐχ ὅτι λυπήσει παρών, ἀλλ' ὅτι λυπεῖ μέλλων. ὃ γὰρ παρὸν οὐκ ἐνοχλεῖ, προσδοκώμενον κενῶς λυπεῖ.[51]

Lists of various fates which await one's corpse also may have existed among the Epicureans, for Philodemus in his *De morte* mentions the fate of one who dies at sea (32, 28 ff) and comments, ". . . τό [θ'] ὑπ' ἰχθ[ύων κ]α[ταβ]ρ[ωθ]ῆναι χεῖρο[ν] ἡμ[εῖν οὐ?]-θὲν ἔχει τοῦ γῆ‹ι› κεκρυμμένον ὑπ' εὐλῶν καὶ σκωλήκων ἢ κείμενον ἐπὶ γῆς ὑπὸ πυρός· ὅταν τε μήτ' ἐκείνων μήτε τούτων αἴσθησις ἧι τῶι

---

[51] Jan Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia cum Fontibus Comparata* (Dissertation Groningen 1877), 169, cites both of these passages as parallels to the doctrine expressed by Lucretius in 870 ff.

Traudel Stork, 187, note 192, lists two apothegmata concerning Epicurus' remarks when he saw, in one instance, a body being torn by crows, and in the other instance a body being torn by birds and wild beasts. In the second instance Epicurus makes the rather memorable remark that the dead man will not have the earth, from which he was born, as a tomb, but the bellies of birds and beasts, a remark which sounds more Cynic than Epicurean. Stork takes these two apothegmata from the *Gnomologium Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743*, ed. Leo Sternbach (*Texte und Kommentare, Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 2*, Berlin 1963), 117, fr. 303.

λειψάνωι, τί δεῖ διαφέρεσθαι;" (32, 36 ff; cf. Bailey, 1142).[52] This passage is quite similar to Bion's enumeration (see above after footnote 39), and may have been derived from the Περὶ ταφῆς or from another Bionean diatribe. Therefore, it cannot be used as proof that the enumeration found in Lucretius (888-893) is of Epicurean origin, since Lucretius and Philodemus may have had Bion as a common source.

Before we conclude this discussion of 870-893, which are so important because of the numerous diatribal traits that they contain, we must briefly investigate the figures in this section, since they are further indications of the poet's use of rhetoric. Especially obvious throughout these lines is the alliteration of which Lucretius is fond. The "s" sounds in 873 have been noted above (see after footnote 40), and to these, as supplementary examples, may be added the "p," "f," and "s" sounds of 871-872, the s's of 883, 886-887, and 890-892, and the v's of 885.[53] The use of this figure, as Kenney has observed (200), "helps to convey L.'s scorn for these silly notions," and, one may add, may be another indication of the influence of the diatribal style, since the Cynic-Stoic genre often employed alliteration and other figures involving similar sounds, presumably as devices helpful in securing the attention of the audience and in rendering a message easy to remember. Since Lucretius was a poet, he could make his alliteration even more effective, if he wished, by creating certain metrical effects. Thus, in lines 884-887, where "v", "s", and "m" sounds predominate, one finds a special emphasis given to the word *se*, already stressed by alliteration, when the poet so arranges his lines that a caesura comes immediately after the *se* in 886 and 887, and before it in 884, while *se* is placed in a prominent position at the

[52] The text is from Taco Kuiper (ed.), *Philodemus over den Dood* (Dissertation Amsterdam 1925), 158, with commentary on 87-90 (cf. 88 on Bion). See also Stork, 11 and 55 ff. and my dissertation, 122-125. Philodemus does mention Bion in the *De Ira* (I 16-19).

For the Epicureans and Bion, cf. Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 120, note 4, and Usener, 263, 10; 269, 19; and 310, 19 (and the apparatus on those pages).

[53] On common alliterations in Lucretius, cf. Deutsch, 17 and *passim*, and Bailey, 146-152. See also Paul Friedländer, "Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius," in *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin 1969), 337-353; Stanley B. Smith, "Introduction to the Commentary", in *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, ed. William E. Leonard and Stanley B. Smith (Madison 1942, rep. 1965), 172 ff. and 497 in the commentary, on line 871.

end of line 885.[54] Since the poet here is stressing the idea of a person concerned about himself, one may assume that the combination of alliteration and position is not fortuitous or dictated solely by metrical exigencies, but rather is intended to make a special impression upon the listener.

Other figures occurring in this section also involve sound or position. In 885, for example, one finds the chiastic arrangement "in vera nullum fore morte alium se" (abba), which stresses the important difference between *true* death and the "vision" of the poet's imaginary character. Word placement creates another figure in 872, where the position of *interfiat* forms the figure *coniunctio*, allowing for brevity of expression (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 27, 38) and connecting the two methods of disposing of a corpse which are mentioned in the line. To the other ornaments cited may be added the homoeoteleuton of lines 877-878, in which the use of *tollit* and *eicit*, augmented by *facit*, resembles the third illustration of the figure provided by Quintilian (IX 3, 77), although the rhetorician's example features asyndeton as well. The important words in Lucretius' usage are the first two verbs, which work together to emphasize the lack of "objectivity" evinced by the person depicted and which have a stronger impact because of their close positioning and similar endings. Sound and word order again are significant in 888, where one finds not only an obvious alliteration of "m" sounds, but also a wordplay based upon the similarity between *malumst* and *malis*, which have an emphatic position in the center of the line before and after a caesura. The wordplay itself seems to be a form of *paronomasia* or *adnominatio*, related to the type produced by "productione eiusdem litterae" and illustrated by the example "Hinc avium dulcedo ducit ad avium" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 21, 29; cf. Quintilian IX 3, 70), although the resemblance in this example is closer than that in the Lucretian line. One final embellishment which deserves mention here is the *amplificatio* which the poet employs in his enumeration in lines 888-893, and which is of the type based upon the use of a word which exaggerates the situation described. Quintilian, for instance, notes concerning this form of *amplificatio*

[54] Concerning the use of the caesura by Lucretius, see Bailey, 111-112, and the sources listed in his footnote on 109, especially W. A. Merrill, "The Characteristics of Lucretius' Verse," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 7 (1924), 221-225.

(VIII 4, 1) that the speaker might call "eum, qui sit caesus, 'occisum', eum, qui sit improbus, 'latronem,' " and say that "eum, qui pulsavit, 'attigisse,' qui vulneravit, 'laesisse'." In his comments about various fates imagined by a foolish man Lucretius first employs this figure when he mentions the possibility of a body being torn by the "malis morsuque ferarum", a description noticeably more graphic than the simple "interfiat malisve ferarum" of 872. Equally amplified is the line (890),

ignibus impositum calidis torrescere flammis,

for the use of the strong verb *torrescere*, instead of a more common word for burning, when combined with both *ignibus* and *flammis*, seems to stress the "suffering," which, of course, the corpse cannot feel, and agrees well with Quintilian's examples of substitutions of exaggerated descriptions for weaker phrases. Lines 891-893 with their notions of "suffocari", instead of embalmment (i.e. *condiri*), of "rigere frigore" on the cold stone, instead of "being laid out" in a tomb, and, finally, of "urgeri" and "obtritum" with the *pondere terrae*, instead of "burial" or some other simple term, provide additional evidence that these lines are a case of "amplificatio", which here, as was mentioned above, creates a picture that is both vivid and humorous (see after footnote 39).[55]

After his rhetorical argument concerning the man who worries about the fate of his own corpse, Lucretius continues his lecture with a paragraph in which the imaginary interlocutor of the diatribe is very much in evidence (894-911; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 204) as the poet once again stresses the concept of the loss of consciousness which comes with death (cf. Bailey, 1143). Presenting first the common idea that a man loses "tot praemia vitae" when he dies, Lucretius employs his imaginary interlocutor (cf. Stork, 77-78), this time in the plural form (*aiunt*) as in the *prooemium* to book III (42), and writes (894-903),

'Iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta, neque uxor
optima nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.
non poteris factis florentibus esse, tuisque
praesidium. misero misere' aiunt 'omnia ademit
una dies infesta tibi tot praemia vitae.'
illud in his rebus non addunt 'nec tibi earum

[55] For the use of forms of *amplificatio* elsewhere in Lucretius, cf. Schrijvers, 208, 215, 226, 228, 283, 295, and 303.

iam desiderium rerum super insidet una.'
quod bene si videant animo dictisque sequantur,
dissoluant animi magno se angore metuque.

In contrast to his use of an imaginary opponent elsewhere the poet here allows the interlocutor to speak directly, presumably to the corpse, and he thus varies his method of presentation from the straightforward report of a common opinion which he gave in his last paragraph.[56] A second use of the interlocutor appears in lines 904-911 where Lucretius again uses dialogue, when he writes (cf. Schrijvers, 285),

'tu quidem ut es leto sopitus, sic eris aevi
quod superest cunctis privatu' doloribus aegris.
at nos horrifico cinefactum te prope busto
insatiabiliter deflevimus, aeternumque
nulla dies nobis maerorem e pectore demet.'
illud ab hoc igitur quaerendum est, quid sit amari
tanto opere, ad somnum si res redit atque quietem,
cur quisquam aeterno possit tabescere luctu.

Both of these instances are related to the other usages of the device by the poet in that the views of the opponent are followed immediately by an instructive comment in which Lucretius shows that his interlocutor is in error. The remarks which the Epicurean poet makes in lines 902-903 and in 909-911, further, contain that mixture of didacticism and ridicule which Lucretius has employed elsewhere (II 47 ff., III 57 ff., III 881 ff.) in answering his imaginary opponent (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 206, on the scornful tone of 909-911).

In the assigning of dialogue to his opponent Lucretius reveals his familiarity not only with the diatribal interlocutor but also with the rhetorical figure known as *sermocinatio*, which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV 52, 65) defines as "cum alicui personae sermo adtribuitur et is exponitur cum ratione dignitatis." [57] Lucretius' purpose in using this figure may be more than the desire for variation, for Bailey has noted that (1143) "the mourners' speeches are rhetorical and reminiscent of funeral orations and sepulchral inscriptions." Perhaps, then, the poet intends for his dialogue passages to be taken as parodies of typical remarks found in

[56] This report is straightforward in the sense that Lucretius, as the "lecturer," presents his character's opinion without dialogue.
[57] Cf. Schrijvers, 285; Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 115.

laudationes funebres or in various types of consolatory literature such as the *epicedion* or the funereal epigram. The remarks concerning the *praemia vitae* which the dead man has lost, for example, easily could be fitted into the "lamentation" (*lamentatio*) section of the typical *epicedion*, which often included references to the loss of friendship and similar joys and complained that the dead man should have lived longer, a theme certainly related to the enjoyment of the good things in life.[58] Closer to the sentiments of Lucretius' interlocutor, however, is the following epitaph from Alexandria (3rd century B.C.), included by Richmond Lattimore in his *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana 1962; 176):[59]

Οὐκέτι δὴ μάτηρ σε, Φιλόξενε, δέξατο χερσὶν
    σὰν ἐρατὰν χρονίως ἀμφιβαλοῦσα δέρην,
οὐδὲ μετ' ἀϊθέων ἀν' ἀγάκλυτον ἤλυθες ἄστυ
    γυμνασίου σκιερῶι γηθόσυνος δαπέδωι.
ἀλλά σου ὄστεα πηγὰ πατὴρ θέτο τεῖδε κομίσσας,
    Καῦνος ἐπεὶ μαλερῶι σάρκας ἔδευσε πυρί.

The image of a mother embracing her son presents a much more simple picture than that in Lucretius' rather sentimental scene, and, although an epigram such as this one could have inspired the Roman poet, his treatment, as René Waltz (96) has noted, approaches "presque à la bouffonnerie". Lucretius sets a tone of pathos through his use of *conduplicatio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 28, 38) with *iam* and then expands upon the simple theme of the dead man's loss of his family, using a form of rhetorical amplification which resembles the figure *congeries*.[60] Thus the poet's interlocutor first mentions that the man's happy home will receive him no longer, and then comments that neither his wife (*uxor optima*) nor his children (*dulces nati*) will run to kiss him and touch "tacita pectus dulcedine". The picture of the whole family running to kiss the head of the household is rather sentimental and is made even more so by the adjectives *optima* and *dulces* and the phrase "tacita dulcedine", all of which are carefully emphasized by the

---

[58] Esteve-Forriol, 137, section 27, C, lists *Lucretius, III* 894-899 as an example of the motif "Klage Um Den Verlust Des Toten."

[59] Cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 204, who quotes Lattimore's translation of the epitaph and remarks that it is "especially close to L.".

[60] Quintilian VIII 4, 26, says of this figure, "potest adscribi amplificationi congeries quoque verborum ac sententiarum idem significantium. nam etiam si non per gradus ascendant, tamen velut acervo quodam adlevantur." See Schrijvers, 232, on *congeries* in III 1029 ff.

poet's use of the figure *transiectio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 32, 44) as well as by the "etymological" relationship between *dulces* and *dulcedine*.

The sentimentalism in lines 894-896 becomes more evident when one considers Lucretius' statements in Book V (1015-1018), where, in his description of the rise of civilization, the poet writes of the beginnings of family life, stating,

> ignis enim curavit ut alsia corpora frigus
> non ita iam possent caeli sub tegmine ferre,
> et Venus imminuit viris puerique parentum
> blanditiis facile ingenium fregere superbum.

Here Lucretius has created a charming picture in only a few words by mentioning the effects produced by children's "blanditiis" upon their parents who are trying to discipline them. Missing is the stress on "dulces" found in III 894-896. Closer to the style and tone of the "sweet" Lucretian passage are the following remarks made by Ovid as he leaves Rome and goes into exile (*Tristia* I 3, 63-68 and 79-81; ed. S. G. Owen, Oxford rep. 1963):

> 'uxor in aeternum vivo mihi viva negatur,
>   et domus et fidae dulcia membra domus,
> quosque ego dilexi fraterno more sodales,
>   o mihi Thesea pectora iuncta fide!
> dum licet, amplectar: numquam fortasse licebit
>   amplius. in lucro est quae datur hora mihi,'
> . . . .
> tum vero coniunx umeris abeuntis inhaerens
>   miscuit haec lacrimis tristia verba meis:
> 'non potes avelli. simul hinc, simul ibimus:' inquit.

The situation in Ovid, of course, is similar to a death-bed scene, even though only exile and not actual death is the topic, and possesses the ingredients of an excessively sentimental scene, although its sincerity and pathos help to offset those ingredients.[61] Unlike the Lucretian passage, further, Ovid's remarks are presented in a simple style which retains its plainness despite such rhetorical devices as the play upon *vivo* and *viva* and the apostrophe in line 66.

---

[61] L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Surveyed* (Cambridge 1962), 150, states that "the famous poem recalling his last night in Rome sounds as sincere as anything he wrote. . . It is a sincere and vivid record of a poignant personal experience, a thing rare in ancient poetry, except on the subject of love or death. . .".

If one compares it with the poet's remarks in V 1015-1018, and with Ovid's description of his departure into exile, the scene in III 894-896 must be seen as a rhetorical exaggeration emphasizing the narrow and sentimental view of the interlocutor who does not realize that the dead man no longer is able to care about anything. The exaggeration becomes even clearer, if one adds to the examples of somewhat similar situations cited above the following imitation by Vergil (*Georgics* II 523-524, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford 1969; cited by Bailey, 1143):

> interea dulces pendent circum oscula nati,
> casta pudicitiam servat domus. . . .

Obviously missing is the emphasis on sweetness provided by the "tacita dulcedine" and the reference to the wife who also comes to greet her husband in the Lucretian passage. In view of greater simplicity of the Greek epitaph, of the Ovidian passage, of the Vergilian imitation, and especially of Lucretius' own reference to the ***blanditiis*** of children, one is tempted to assume that the amplification found in III 894-896 and the emphasis on loss and misery found in III 897-899 are not due to any emotionalism on the part of the poet, but rather are intended as a parody of the type of expression found in grave inscriptions such as the one quoted above (at footnote 59) or in the lamentation sections of *epicedia*, which, incidentally, could have influenced Ovid's method of presentation in *Tristia* I 3.

Another possible source of inspiration for the poet, or perhaps a source for his technique, is the rhetorical practice of including an "appeal to pity" (*commiseratio, Rhetorica ad Herennium* II 31, 50; *conquestio*, Cicero *De inventione* I 55, 106) in the concluding section of a forensic speech. One of the common topics used within this section was that in which "disiunctio deploratur ab aliquo, cum diducaris ab eo quicum libentissime vixeris, ut a parente filio, a fratre familiari" (Cicero, *De inventione* I 55, 109). Further, another commonplace of the *conquestio* required the speaker to compare his previous good fortune with his present misfortune (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* II 31, 50). Lucretius undoubtedly was familiar with these topics, and he might have used them almost automatically, when he wished to portray the convential attitude toward separation caused by death. In fact, the remarks made by the interlocutor in 894-899 easily would fit into the *conquestio* of a speech delivered

by the prosecution at a murder trial, if one imagines the speaker arousing pity by addressing the victim and depicting the loss incurred by him and by his family (cf. Quintilian VI 1, 18; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 151, note g). One could assume, then, that Lucretius has parodied a portion of a typical forensic speech, but, in view of the other topics found within this paragraph (cf. 904 ff.), it seems more likely that the object of the poet's parody is some type of consolatory literature such as the *epicedion*, which obviously has some topics in common with the *conquestio*.[62] Further, as Heinze (*Lucretius III*, 170) has noted, the theme appears in Philodemus' *De Morte*, column 25, where the Epicurean writes,

> "τὸ καταλείπειν γονεῖς ἢ παῖδας ἢ γαμετὴν ἤ τινας ἄλλους τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, ἐν συμφοραῖς ἐσομένους διὰ τὴν καταστροφὴν ἡμῶν ἢ καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐλλείψοντας, ἔχει μὲν ἀμέλει φυσικώτατον δηγμὸν καὶ δακρύων προέσεις ἐγείρει τῷ νοῦν ἔχοντι μόνον ἢ μάλιστα."

Since Philodemus was influenced by consolatory literature and by the diatribes of Bion (see footnote 52), the topic in these lines could have been taken by him from a *consolatio*, an *epicedion*, or what is also likely, from a diatribe such as Bion's Περὶ ταφῆς, since the emphasis of the argument is on the fact that the dead man no longer is able to care about his family or his own affairs, a concept which is compatible with Cynic doctrine (cf. the anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope, above after footnote 44). Lucretius's remarks include the same emphasis, for the poet writes in lines 900-904,

> illud in his rebus non addunt 'nec tibi earum
> iam desiderium rerum super insidet una.'
> quod bene si videant animo dictisque sequantur,
> dissoluant animi magno se angore metuque.

It is not impossible that this theme occurred in a Bionean diatribe and that both Lucretius and Philodemus, who often reveal a dependence upon, or at least a knowledge of, Bion's works, took

[62] Cf. Esteve-Forriol, 137-140, for motives of the lamentation (*lamentatio*). The typical Roman *laudatio funebris* at this period did not deal with such sentimental topics. See George Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300* (Princeton 1972) 21-23.

On Greek funeral orations, see Joachim Soffel, *Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede in ihrer Tradition dargestellt, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 57; Meisenheim am Glan 1974).

over from that "philosopher" the topic concerning the dead man's loss not only of his family but also of all concern for his loss. Even if Lucretius found his theme in Bion rather than in some consolatory work, however, the apparent parody which he has created seems to be his own, especially since the remark found in Philodemus seems to resemble the style of Bion more closely than Lucretius' treatment does.[63]

After his remarks concerning the dead man's loss of "desiderium rerum" Lucretius deals with another common topic of consolatory literature in a fashion which suggests that, as in lines 894 ff., the poet again is parodying expressions found within the *lamentatio* sections of an *epicedion* or an oration or in tomb inscriptions.[64] The grief of the survivors, which forms the subject of lines 904-911, is a theme appearing in the *threnos* sections of funeral orations, fashioned after Greek rhetorical theory, where it takes the form of the idea that "sorrow is appropriate"[65] and in the *lamentatio* and the *descriptio funeris et sepulcri* of *epicedia* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, 138-139, and 144 ff.). Within the *epicedion*, for example, may occur descriptions of the manifestations of grief, such as tears, scratching of the cheeks, tearing of the hair, as well as comments dealing with the sorrow felt by children as compared with their elders or by husbands as compared with wives or vice versa, when a spouse has died (Esteve-Forriol, 144-145). One also finds Hellenistic epigrams which express the sorrow of the bereaved who continue to weep (cf. Lucretius, 907 "insatiabiliter deflevimus")

---

[63] The topic also must be considered Epicurean, of course, in view of its emphasis upon the loss of sensation, but, for the reasons mentioned, a diatribal rather than an Epicurean source seems highly likely.

For other manifestations of this theme, cf. Stork, 62 ff.; *Axiochus*, 365c-d; Cicero, *Tusculans* I 34, 82-36, 88. See also Teles, 61, 5, where the interlocutor complains "Χρειῶν γὰρ ἐστέρημαι."

One should note here that Lucretius' parody is directed at the sentimental and foolish views of his interlocutor and is not a direct attack upon the family life depicted.

[64] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 206 recognizes the satirical nature of these lines and observes that "the speaker is made to express the feelings of the bereaved in unmistakably satirical terms: L. is mocking the commonplaces of the formal *lamentatio* and the epitaph." Further, according to Kenney (Ibid.), "grief was recognized by Epicurus as natural (D. L. 10.119); L. attacks, not mourning itself, but its more extravagant manifestations." Cf. Waltz, 96 (as quoted above after footnote 59).

[65] Theodore C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 156.

after the burial of a loved one. For instance, Leonidas of Tarentum writes,[66]

ʾΑ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, δειλὴ δ' ἐγὼ ἡ τὸν ἐν ἥβης
 ἀκμῇ καὶ μοῦνον παῖδα πυρωσαμένη,
Ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ὃς ἀπώλεο, τέκνον· ἐγὼ δὲ
 ὀρφάνιον κλαίω γῆρας ὀδυρομένη.
Βαίην εἰς Ἄϊδος σκιερὸν δόμον· οὔτε μοι ἠὼς
 ἡδεῖ', οὔτ' ἀκτὶς ὠκέος ἠελίου·
ʾΑ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, μεμορημένε, πένθεος εἴης
 ἰητήρ, ζωῆς ἔκ με κομισσάμενος.

Similar sentiments appear in Latin tomb inscriptions[67] such as (Lattimore, 181; CE 55, 16-17),

reliqui fletum nata genitori meo
et antecessi, genita post, leti diem,

or (*Ibid.*; CE 367, 1-2),

miserabilis hora
quoi lucem eripuit caroque viro dedit luctum,

or the fuller description (182; CE 398, 4-7),

liquit et orbatos miseros fidosque parentes:
uberibus pressis nutricem liquit amantem,
coniunx nutricis infelix ille relictus
maeret et ad cineres plangit sua pectora palmis.

The idea of "death as sleep" (Kenney's term, *Lucretius III*, 207) also is well attested in Greek epigrams and Latin tomb inscriptions. In the *Greek Anthology*, for example, one finds a poem by Diotimus in which he laments (Mackail, 269, XVII; cf. Gow and Page, 1769),

Αἰαί, Θηρίμαχος δὲ παρὰ δρυὶ τὸν μακρὸν εὕδει
 ὕπνον· ἐκοιμήθη δ' ἐκ πυρὸς οὐρανίου.

The Hellenistic poet Dionysius also writes of the sleep of death, observing (Mackail, 264, V; cf. Gow and Page, 1441),

Πρηΰτερον γῆράς σε καὶ οὐ κατὰ νοῦσος ἀμαυρὴ
 ἔσβεσεν, εὐνήθης δ' ὕπνον ὀφειλόμενον
Ἄκρα μεριμνήσας Ἐρατόσθενες.

---

[66] Quoted from *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, ed. J. W. Mackail (London 1906), 278, poem XXXVII.
On Lucretius and the Alexandrians, cf. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," 366-392.

[67] Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 172, also lists several examples of Latin tomb inscriptions.

Among Latin tomb inscriptions, further, appear lines such as (Lattimore, 82; CE 481, 3),

hic iacet aeterno devinctus membra sopore,

and (*Ibid.*; CE 1997, 8),

hic tumulata silet aeterno munere somni.[68]

Lucretius, therefore, was dealing with two very common themes when he allowed his interlocutor to tell the dead man, "es leto sopitus", and to complain of the "aeternum maerorem" of the survivors.

Working with these themes the poet has created a parody of their typical expressions through the use of exaggeration. The antithesis between the sleep of the dead and the constant grieving of the survivors, the use of asyndeton in 905, and the *transiectio* created by the separation of *horrifico* and *busto* in 906 and *aeternumque* and *maerorem* in 907-908 are indicative of the essentially rhetorical nature of remarks of the interlocutor, but of chief importance within this passage is the hyperbole (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 33, 44) created by the use of *aeternumque maerorem* and *nulla dies*, since these are obvious exaggerations. No grief can be eternal, since no man is, and one cannot promise that no day will be free of grief, since one cannot see into the future. Further, as Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 206) has observed, Lucretius here "seizes on the conventional promise never to forget the dead person . . . with all the scorn that he habitually brings to bear on a false philosophical position." One senses that scorn in the exaggerations which the poet attributes to his interlocutor and also in Lucretius' reply, in which he comments (909-911),

illud ab hoc igitur quaerendum est, quid sit amari
tanto opere, ad somnum si res redit atque quietem,
cur quisquam aeterno possit tabescere luctu.

The poet sarcastically throws the opponent's words back at him by pointing out the contradiction involved in maintaining "perpetual mourning" for sleep and rest which normally are not considered

[68] See Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 207, who states that "death as sleep was and is a popular idea (Lattimore 82-3)" and notes that it is "a standard ingredient of the *consolatio*. . .". Lattimore, 82, mentions the formulae "somno aeterno" and "aeterni quieti et perpetuae securitati."

anything bitter.[69] Further, the indirect question in these lines serves the same purpose as a rhetorical question which is posed "ubi respondendi difficilis est ratio" (Quintilian IX 2, 8), since the view of the interlocutor is made to seem childishly ridiculous. The use of strong antithesis and hyperbole and the scorn just mentioned, with which the poet replies, all are indications that lines 904-908 are intended to be a parody of the conventional expressions noted above. Additional evidence for parody is provided by the sound of line 907,

> insatiabiliter deflevimus, aeternumque.

Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 206) notes the facts that the line has only three words and one caesura and that it ends with a word composed of four spondees, all characteristics which "combine to make it probably unique in serious Latin poetry" and probably also "grotesque" in its "effect on the Roman ear." The ponderous nature of line 907, in fact, suggests that the poet "may be deriding the often limping hexameters found on Roman tombstones" (*Ibid.*, 207).[70] Even if Lucretius is not parodying a bad metrical style as Kenney suggests, he certainly must be mocking the pomposity or pretentiousness of the notion that grief is eternal and has used a style in 907 which reflects the exaggeration which he is ridiculing.

The sarcastic tone, the likely parody, and the modified rhetorical question suggest that a possible source for the sentiment which Lucretius expresses here is not his Epicurean predecessors but rather is a diatribe by Bion or his imitators.[71] One finds in Teles (59, 6 ff.;

---

[69] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 208, comments that Lucretius ". . .as a good Epicurean disdains the trite symbol and turns it back on the innocent speaker: 'you talk of the dead being "at rest"; if you believe that, where is the sense in perpetual mourning?' "

[70] West, 29 (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 207), makes the following acute observations concerning 898-9 and 906-8:

> Instead of taking such statements as manifestations of L'Anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce, we should remember that each of these arguments is punctually and brusquely rejected by Lucretius speaking in his own voice, and later even more peremptorily by Nature, who takes over his part in the dialogue. Surely these pathetic rhetorical figures and astonishing rhythms are meant as sarcastic caricatures of the mawkish clichés used by such *stulti* and *baratri*. *Insatiabiliter* for instance is not necessarily an elevated word. Its only other use in Lucretius is of swine rolling in filth, 6, 978.

[71] On the Epicurean attitude toward grief, cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 172 and Usener, 138, fr. 120 (Plutarch, *Contra Epicuri beatitudinem* 20,

cf. Oltramare, 62, theme 79), for example, a passage in which the diatribist discusses the attitude proper for the bereaved, asking, "how is it not irrational and otherwise foolish to sit weeping and grieving and destroying oneself besides, when a friend has died?" Teles then adds his advice, stating that, "ἵνα καί τι μᾶλλον φιλόσοφος δόξῃ παρὰ τοῖς ἀποπλήκτοις," it is necessary to "πρὸ τοῦ τελευτῆσαι τὸν φίλον ὀδυνᾶσθαι <καὶ> κλαίειν, ἐνθυμούμενον ὅτι αὐτῷ ὁ φίλος θνητὸς ἐγένετο καὶ ἄνθρωπος." Obviously this passage is not Lucretius' model, since it is concerned only with the avoidance of grief and the creation of a state of "apathy", but it has been mentioned here to indicate that topics concerning bereavement were not limited to consolatory literature but also appeared in the diatribe. It is not impossible, then, that a Bionean diatribe dealt with themes such as those expressed by the Epicurean poet in 904-911, especially since, as has been noted above, Bion in his Περὶ ταφῆς and perhaps elsewhere dealt with themes concerning burial and in connection with these may have discussed the dead man's loss of consciousness and of concern for family and property (cf. Lucretius III 894 ff. and above after footnote 39) and also the foolishness of extravagant grief. Certainly Lucretius' sarcastic remark and his ridiculing of common topics of consolatory literature suggest that the poet's attitude is compatible with the diatribal style and with Bion's famous *spoudaiogeloion*. The Epicurean poet, of course, did not have to have a specific source at hand to inspire him to use the diatribal style, for, since he was familiar with the traits of that genre, he could apply them at will when his topic seemed to warrant their use. Thus, even if no diatribe by Bion or his imitators had ever dealt with the topic of excessive grief, Lucretius still could have composed his own diatribe upon that theme. Even though one cannot prove that the poet had a definite diatribal source for III 904-911, then, one must admit that the style, and especially the tone, place this passage as well as the

---

1101a). Cf. Bailey, 1143, who notes that in contrast to Lucretius, "Epicurus himself appears to have taken a more natural and humane view; he says that 'the wise man will grieve' " (Diogenes Laertius X 119).

Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia*, 170 states "Num tamen tota ex Epicuri mente sit haec consolatio dubitamus; non enim convenit cum laudata animi ἀταραξίᾳ si mortem requiem habes vitae malorum. Pariter vituperat Epicurus qui mortem ut malorum maximum fugiunt, atque eos, qui eam ut requiem eorum, quae in vita sunt, tristium cupiunt. . .". Woltjer then cites the *Letter to Menoeceus* 125 (the last sentence within that passage).

preceding ten lines, within the diatribal tradition, rather than within the tradition of the *consolatio* or the *epicedion*, which certainly would not attempt to comfort the bereaved by jeering at his opinions.

Following his diatribal treatment of grief Lucretius proceeds to his next topic, which has its roots in both Epicurean and diatribal literature. The poet employs his interlocutor once again (who, obviously, is not the same one every time, but rather is a device representing common opinions) [72] and writes (912-918),

> Hoc etiam faciunt ubi discubuere tenentque
> pocula saepe homines et inumbrant ora coronis,
> ex animo ut dicant 'brevis hic est fructus homullis;
> iam fuerit neque post umquam revocare licebit.'
> tamquam in morte mali cum primis hoc sit eorum,
> quod sitis exurat miseros atque arida torrat,
> aut aliae cuius desiderium insideat rei.

The use of the interlocutor, who mouths a common platitude,[73] and the sarcasm of the poet's comment about this opinion (916-918) suggest that these lines are written in the diatribal style and that one should look to the Cynic-Stoic genre for the source of the theme. None of the fragments of Bion in Teles, however, deal precisely with the complaint that life is short or with the idea that death is like sleep. The fact that Lucretius depends heavily upon Bion in lines 931-954, which will be discussed presently, may indicate that in lines 912 ff. he also followed a diatribal source, using, perhaps, part of a sermon dealing with "αὐτάρκεια" or with death and combining it with Epicurean views on death (see below after footnote 76).

As has been mentioned above, however, Lucretius did not need to follow a specific diatribe when he employed the diatribal style. Therefore, we may not assume that Bion or his imitators *necessarily* dealt with the themes which the Epicurean poet discusses in 912-930, for Lucretius once again may have taken over a common

---

[72] Even though Lucretius uses the plural here (*dicant*), I am taking it as a generalization and retaining the singular terms "interlocutor" or "opponent." Cf. Stork, 78; see Schrijvers, 285, on *sermocinatio*.

[73] Cf. Otto, 375, who lists examples of the same theme, such as Plautus, Most. 726, "Vita quam sit brevis, cogita"; Cicero, Phil. 14, 12, 32, "Brevis a natura vita nobis data est"; Sallust, Catil. 1, 3, "quoniam vita ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est"; and Publilius Syrus, 438, "o vitam misero longam, felici brevem."

scene from literature and ridiculed it in order to expound his Epicurean doctrine (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 208). Within the *Greek Anthology*, for example, appears the following epigram by Aesclepiades (Mackail, 289, 11; Gow and Page, 884 ff.), which expresses feelings similar to those of Lucretius' interlocutor:

Πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς·
ἢ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
Πίνωμεν γαλερῶς· μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

The concept of the brevity of life and the need to enjoy oneself while one can is, of course, older than the Hellenistic poems of the *Greek Anthology* and can be found, for example, in Theognis (1047 ff.), in Attic *skolia*, and in the Greek lyric poet Alcaeus,[74] as well as in the comic poet Amphis, whose remark concerning the brevity of life is preserved by Athenaeus (336c, cited by Bailey, 1147). Further, one finds the theme also in tomb inscriptions such as (CE 245; Lattimore, 262),

Vive laetus quique vivis, vita parvo(m) munus est,
mox exorta est, sensim vigescit, deinde sensim deficit,

and (CE 2070, 3-4; Lattimore, 262).

discit]e mortales in spem non vivere longam
uti quod voluit tempore, tempus abet.

While all of these expressions of a common theme are examples of possible sources for the poet's topic, the use of a banquet scene combined with a "philosophical" comment upon the brevity of life seems to reflect most closely the type of activity and thought common in Greek epigrams such as that of Aesclepiades quoted above (cf. Apollonides in Mackail, 288, 8). Lucretius possibly intended his interlocutor's remarks to be a parody of statements resembling the last two lines of Aesclepiades' poem, for the use of the diminutive *homullis* seems to be an intentional exaggeration, indicative, perhaps, of the drunken state of the speaker (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 209, on *pocula*), who still, however, seems to be able to enunciate the homoeoteleuton of *fuerit* and *licebit*. In his remarks which follow this parody or at least satirical usage of a common theme the Epicurean poet sarcastically points out the

[74] Giuseppe Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," in *Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique, Entretiens* 14 (L'Epigramme Grecque; Genève 1967), 102, 104, 107.

ridiculous nature of the opinions expressed in 912-915, thereby employing the same method which he used in lines 893-911 and utilizing diatribal *spoudaiogeloion* to demolish his opponent.

After this parody in which he uses an interlocutor the poet includes an obviously Epicurean explanation in which he employs an analogy to illustrate his point. Lucretius informs his audience (919-930),

> nec sibi enim quisquam tum se vitamque requirit,
> cum pariter mens et corpus sopita quiescunt.
> nam licet aeternum per nos sic esse soporem,
> nec desiderium nostri nos adficit ullum.
> et tamen haudquaquam nostros tunc illa per artus
> longe ab sensiferis primordia motibus errant,
> cum correptus homo ex somno se colligit ipse.
> multo igitur mortem minus ad nos esse putandumst,
> si minus esse potest quam quod nil esse videmus;
> maior enim turbae disiectus materiai
> consequitur leto nec quisquam expergitus exstat,
> frigida quem semel est vitai pausa secuta.

The connection between these lines and the banquet scene which precedes them is provided by the idea of the lack of a "desiderium rei" (in line 918), which allows the poet to insert his analogy beginning with the remark that when one is asleep "nec sibi. . .se vitamque requirit." The unconsciousness and lack of *desiderium ullum* when a man is sleeping and his *primordia* are not wandering "longe ab sensiferis . . . motibus" then are presented as an illustration of death which is "multo . . . minus ad nos," since it is accompanied by a greater scattering of matter, and since one does not awake from it. In his comparison of the known experience, sleep, with the unknown experience, death, Lucretius not only has expounded Epicurean doctrine concerning the behavior of the soul in sleep and in death (cf. Bailey, 1147 and Lucretius IV 916 ff.), but he also has created a typically Epicurean argument based upon an analogy drawn between something which can be known by sense perception (sleep) and something which cannot be grasped by the senses, but which can be known because of its correspondence to something within the sensible world. In other words, taking the condition of a sleeping man as a sign the poet has inferred from that sign the nature of death which represents a greater disruption of the

motions of soul atoms than sleep does.[75] One should note here that Lucretius is not claiming that death is sleep, which, of course, would be a position contrary to Epicurean doctrine. He only is using sleep as an easily understood analogy by which the greater, and complete, lack of consciousness that comes with death can be illustrated. The purpose of this carefully drawn analogy is not only illustration, however, for the poet is using it also as a reinforcement of the ideas which he expressed in 909-911 and in 916-918 (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 210 on 919) and especially the notion that "it is absurd to anticipate a sense of loss that one will not in fact feel." (Kenney, *ibid.*). In constructing his illustrative analogy, Lucretius could have drawn upon consolatory literature, where the idea of the similarity between sleep and death was a commonplace (Kenney, *ibid.*, citing Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* I 92),[76] or upon a diatribe of Bion, since the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (ed. Sternbach; 67, fr. 160) reports that Bion said that there are two rehearsals (διδασκαλίας) for death,[76A] the one being the time before one is born (cf. Lucretius, III 832 ff.), and the other being sleep (cf. Oltramare, 48, theme 25b). The inclusion of Epicurean doctrine concerning the disruption of atomic motion, however, seems to indicate that the poet at least combined Epicurean material with a consolatory or diatribal topic, if he did not indeed take over an Epicurean argument (which seems possible).

The use of an analogy based upon a common experience is, of course, compatible with the diatribal style which the poet employs in lines 912-918, although the analogy itself is a rather serious explanation which abandons the *spoudaiogeloion* of the preceding lines and therefore actually heightens the sarcasm of 916-918 by demonstrating the "true" state of affairs which the interlocutor is too foolish to realize. Lines 919-930 also differ stylistically from 912-918, for the diatribal section abounds in homoeoteleuton, a

[75] Cf. DeLacy and DeLacy, 142, who write concerning this method, "knowledge of unperceived objects, being mediate, is acquired by means of signs. Using objects of immediate experience as signs, we make inferences concerning the nature of the things which are at least in part unknown to and not experienced by us."

[76] Cf. Stork, 74, and Plato *Apology* 40c-d; ps.-Plutarch *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 107d.

See also Oltramare, 113, who notes the Epicurean themes in 916-930 and mentions his theme 25b.

[76A] One might also translate διδασκαλίας as lessons or examples used for teaching purposes, i.e. models.

favorite figure of the Cynic-Stoic genre. The correspondence between *fuerit* and *licebit* already has been noted above, and to it may be added the *exurat, torrat* and *insideat* of 917-918, which conform to the definition of the figure given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (see footnote 128 below).

Further, in lines 912-913 one finds a prime example of polysyndeton used in connection with verbs which are not similar enough to be classified as examples of homoeoteleuton but which provide the type of simple parallelism which one can find in the style of Bion, a parallelism which also is evident in lines 917-918.[77] This entire passage, from 912-918, resembles the diatribal style in its use of homoeoteleuton, polysyndeton, and of parallelism with rather simple sentences (cf. chapter I, after footnote 16), as well as in its use of an interlocutor, of a parody, and of *spoudaiogeloion*. One also should note the presence of *amplificatio* (see above after footnote 54) in these lines, for the use of that figure contributes to the rhetorical effect of the passage. Thus, the men at the feast do not merely drink and speak, but they recline, hold their cups, "shade their brows with garlands" (Bailey, 349), and speak "ex animo", a scene notable for its vividness (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 39, 51 on *descriptio* and Schrijvers, 285 on *enargeia*). *Amplificatio* again is in evidence in 917, where the poet tells of thirst which consumes (*exurat*) and bakes (*torrat*) the *miseros*, instead of merely afflicting them.

The analogy (919-930) which follows this section is developed in what Kenney has called the expository style of Lucretius [78] and is not lacking in rhetorical figures, although those devices which it employs are somewhat less obvious than the homoeoteleuta of 912-918. Lines 921-922, for example, include an example of homoeoptoton in the correspondence between *aeternum soporem* and *desiderium ullum*, as well as an obvious use of chiasmus in the

---

[77] Cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 45-46 and 48-50; chapter I above, after footnote 16.

[78] Because of its lack of enjambment the diatribal passage (912-918) resembles the expository style. Lucretius' linear or unperiodic style (on which cf. Kenney, 25) can attain the simplicity often exemplified in the diatribe, but one must take Epicurean influence into account and should not assume that the expository style developed as a result of diatribal influence. Generally, expository passages have more in common with the philosophical treatise than with the diatribe, although a combination of influences is possible. On the pathetic and expository styles, cf. Kenney, 23-29.

arrangement of these nouns and adjectives. An additional example of chiasmus appears in line 928 in which the nouns *turbae* and *disiectus* are framed by the words which qualify them, that is the adjective *maior* which modifies *disiectus* and the genitive noun *materiai* which belongs with *turbae*. To these figures may be added the alliteration in 926 (cf. Deutsch, 54), the possible wordplay created by the proximity of *homo* and *somno* in 925, and the *transiectio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 32, 44) of *illa*, which creates a type of chiasmus with *illa* and *sensiferis* separated from *primordia* and *motibus* (aabb), augmented by the flow of the enjambment, and seems to emphasize the idea of distance. None of these figures is exaggerated, but, rather, each fits naturally within its line or lines, a fact which suggests that the parallelism and homoeoteleuta are exaggerated intentionally in lines 912-918 in order to strengthen the parody which Lucretius seems to have created.

After his analogy comparing sleep and death Lucretius includes a section whose obvious relationship to the works of Bion frequently has been mentioned but not thoroughly analyzed in terms of the diatribal style.[79] In lines 931-977 the Epicurean poet employs the rhetorical devices known as *prosopopoiia* (or *conformatio*), which is defined as (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 53, 66) "cum aliqua quae non adest persona confingitur quasi adsit, aut cum res muta aut informis fit eloquens, et forma ei et oratio adtribuitur," and *licentia* (or *parrhesia*), which is utilized (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 36, 48) when "apud eos quos aut vereri aut metuere debemus tamen aliquid pro iure nostro dicimus, quod eos aut quos ii diligunt aliquo in errato vere reprehendere videamur." The first of these devices appears in a fragment of Bion preserved in Teles' Περὶ αὐταρκείας, while the second is a standard feature of the work of Bion and his imitators, as well as of the Cynic predecessors of the diatribe writer.[80] Since Lucretius' *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* bears a

---

[79] Cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 175-176; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 212 ff.; Bailey, 1149; Ernout and Robin, II, 146; Stork, 77 ff. and 92, who briefly compares Bion and Lucretius; Arthur Darby Nock (ed.), Sallustius, *Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (Cambridge 1926), xxviii (cf. Edwin A. Judge, "Saint Paul and Classical Society," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972), 19-36).

[80] On *parrhesia* cf. Diogenes of Sinope in Diogenes Laertius VI 69; Mary A. Grant, 55; Giuseppe Scarpat, *Parrhesia, Storia del termine e delle sue traduzioni in Latino* (Brescia 1964), 62 ff.; Marcello Gigante, *Ricerche Filodemee* (Biblioteca della Parola del Passato 6; Napoli 1969), 41-61, on Epicurean *parrhesia*.

strong resemblance to Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, the following discussion will attempt to show the close relationship between the style and content of Lucretius III 931-977, and the work of Bion as illustrated by the fragments which are preserved in Teles.

For convenience of discussion Lucretius' *prosopopoiia* may be divided into two sections, comprising lines 931-951 and 952-977. In the first of these the poet writes as follows:

> Denique si vocem rerum natura repente
> mittat et hoc alicui nostrum sic increpet ipsa
> 'quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris
> luctibus indulges? quid mortem congemis ac fles?
> nam si grata fuit tibi vita anteacta priorque
> et non omnia pertusum congesta quasi in vas
> commoda perfluxere atque ingrata interiere,
> cur non ut plenus vitae conviva recedis
> aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietem?
> sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
> vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
> rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,
> non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?
> nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
> quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.
> si tibi non annis corpus iam marcet et artus
> confecti languent, eadem tamen omnia restant,
> omnia si perges vivendo vincere saecla,
> atque etiam potius, si numquam sis moriturus;'
> quid respondemus, nisi iustam intendere litem
> naturam et veram verbis exponere causam?

The similarities between these lines and Bion's *prosopopoiia* of Penia become evident when one compares the Lucretian passage with the following remarks of Bion (Teles, 6, 8-8, 5): [81]

> διὸ καὶ εἰ λάβοι, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, φωνὴν τὰ πράγματα, ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ δύναιτο δικαιολογεῖσθαι, οὐκ ἂν εἴποι, φησίν, [πρῶτον ἡ πενία, ἄνθρωπε, τί μοι μάχῃ;] ὥσπερ οἰκέτης πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἐφ' ἱερὸν καθίσας δικαιολογεῖται 'τί μοι μάχῃ; μή τί σοι κέκλοφα; οὐ πᾶν τὸ προσταττόμενον ὑπὸ σοῦ ποιῶ; οὐ τὴν ἀποφορὰν εὐτάκτως σοι φέρω;' καὶ ἡ Πενία <ἂν> εἴποι πρὸς τὸν ἐγκαλοῦντα 'τί μοι μάχῃ; μὴ καλοῦ τινος δι' ἐμὲ στερίσκῃ; μὴ σωφροσύνης; μὴ δι-

[81] Cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 45-46 and 333 (footnotes 106-109); D. R. Dudley, *Cynicism*, 67, who translates part of this passage; G. C. Fiske, 184 on the general influence of the *prosopopoiia*; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Philologische Untersuchungen, ed. A. Kiessling und U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 4; Berlin 1881), 297, note 8, on Bion's *prosopopoiia*.

καιοσύνης; <μὴ> ἀνδρείας; ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς εἶ; ἢ οὐ μεσταὶ μὲν αἱ ὁδοὶ λαχάνων, πλήρεις δὲ αἱ κρῆναι ὕδατος; οὐχ εὐνάς σοι τοσαύτας παρέχω ὁπόση γῆ; καὶ στρωμνὰς φύλλα; ἢ εὐφραίνεσθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν; ἢ οὐχ ὁρᾷς γρᾴδια φυστὴν φαγόντα τερετίζοντα; ἢ οὐκ ὄψον ἀδάπανον καὶ ἀτρύφερον παρασκευάζω σοι τὴν πεῖναν; ἢ οὐχ ὁ πεινῶν ἥδιστα ἐσθίει καὶ ἥκιστα ὄψου δεῖται; καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἥδιστα πίνει καὶ ἥκιστα τὸ μὴ παρὸν ποτὸν ἀναμένει; ἢ πεινᾷ τις πλακοῦντα ἢ διψᾷ Χῖον; ἀλλ' οὐ ταῦτα διὰ τρυφὴν ζητοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι; ἢ οἰκήσεις οὐ παρέχω σοι προῖκα, τὸν μὲν χειμῶνα τὰ βαλανεῖα, θέρους δὲ τὰ ἱερά; . . .' εἰ ταῦτα λέγοι ἡ Πενία, τί ἂν ἔχοις ἀντειπεῖν;

The resemblances begin with the first sentences of each of these passages, for Lucretius' first two lines, and possibly his address to "mortalis" in line 933, correspond to Bion's first sentence (cf. Vallette, 538, footnote 2; Stork, 92). Lucretius' *Denique si*, thus, may be a translation of the Greek διὸ καὶ εἰ while *vocem mittat* corresponds to λάβοι φωνήν, and if one could remove the brackets, then *mortalis* would reflect ἄνθρωπε. Although these similarities are impressive and, in view of others which will be indicated presently, seem to point to the direct dependence of the Epicurean poet upon Bion, it is not impossible that the opening lines of both *prosopopoiia* are formulae derived from rhetorical tradition (cf. Bailey, 1151). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for instance, begins one of its examples of *prosopopoiia* with (IV 53, 66), "quodsi nunc haec urbs invictissima vocem mittat, non hoc pacto loquatur: . . ., o cives, . . .," in which the *quodsi*, *vocem mittat*, and the address to the citizens could be considered parallel to Lucretius' *si*, *vocem mittat*, and *mortalis*. Similarities between Bion and Lucretius are not limited to their opening remarks, however, for Lucretius' concluding question, despite its legal imagery (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius, III*, 216 and Stork, 94, who also note the correspondence between Lucretius and Bion), corresponds to the concluding question of Bion's *prosopopoiia*, where the author also intrudes to make his query. The Latin "quid respondemus," thus, resembles the Greek "τί ἂν ἔχοις ἀντειπεῖν", while Lucretius' comment that one would have to say that Natura has presented a *iustam litem* corresponds in its position, and in its hint of the impossibility of disagreement, with Bion's δοκῶ ἄφωνος γενέσθαι (8,6).

After their opening remarks both Bion and Lucretius launch their attacks upon an imaginary opponent by using rhetorical questions (cf. Stork, 92), a favorite device of the diatribal style.

The topics of the first questions posed by each author are different, but one must see in *Penia*'s query, "τί μοι μάχῃ;," a model for the spirit, at least, of Lucretius' question (933-934),

quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris
luctibus indulges?

Further, the theme of dissatisfaction or the inability to be content with what one possesses which underlies *Penia*'s questions possibly is reflected in Lucretius 944-945, where Natura warns,

nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.

A closer thematic and verbal parallel is provided by lines 938-939,

cur non ut plenus vitae conviva recedis
aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietem?,

which do not correspond to any specific statement in the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, but do bear a strong resemblance to Bion's remark "οὐχ ὑπομένω, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐκ συμποσίου ἀπαλλάττομαι οὐθὲν δυσχεραίνων, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βίου, ὅταν [ἡ] ὥρα ᾖ . . .," which is preserved in a fragment of Teles' Περὶ αὐταρκείας.[82] This correspondence suggests that Lucretius may have combined the technique of the *prosopopoiia* which he found in one Bionean diatribe with themes from another diatribe or elsewhere within the same work by that "philosopher". As Bailey has noted (1152; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 214), however, the idea of quitting life as one would leave a banquet as a "quasi-philosophical commonplace," and is attributed to Epicurus as well as to Bion. Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations* (V 41, 118; Usener, 310, fr.

---

[82] Teles, 16, 2; Oltramare, 111 and theme 43d. This parallel frequently has been observed. Cf. Bailey, 938; Ernout and Robin, II, 148; Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 177; Stork, 79. Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia*, 171 strangely attributes this remark to Epicurus and gives only Stobaeus, with no reference, as a source. Stobaeus, of course, has preserved the Teles fragment in which Bion's remark appears. Perhaps Woltjer was thinking of the section from Cicero's *Tusculans* (V 41, 118; Usener, frag. 499; cf. Stork, 79 and note 255; Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 120, note 4) quoted above after footnote 82.

Cf. Murley, 383, for the appearance of this commonplace in Horace *Serm.* I 1, 119.

Regarding 945-946 cf. Otto Regenbogen, "Lukrez, seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht," in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Franz Dirlmeier (München 1961), 348; Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 178; Philodemus *De morte* 19, 33-35.

On *vas* in 936, see Regenbogen, 329-330; Heinze, 176-177.

499; cf. Bailey, 1152), for example, makes the following remarks concerning Epicurus' use of the theme:

> Mihi quidem in vita servanda videtur illa lex, quae in Graecorum conviviis optinetur. 'aut bibat' inquit 'aut abeat,' et recte. aut enim fruatur aliquis pariter cum aliis voluptate potandi aut, ne sobrius in violentiam vinulentorum incidat, ante discedat. sic iniurias fortunae, quas ferre nequeas, defugiendo relinquas. Haec eadem quae Epicurus totidem verbis dicit Hieronymus.

Naturally, we are faced here with the usual problems encountered when one tries to locate the specific source for a commonplace. Oltramare (111-112) nevertheless has sought to pinpoint a source, and he argues that "Lucrèce ne peut avoir suivi Epicure sur ce point; si ce philosophe emprunta en effet à la diatribe cette image, ce fut pour défendre le droit au suicide." Further, "nous sommes amené à supposer ici une source sinon directement bionesque, du moins beaucoup plus proche de Bion que les écrits d'Epicure." Since Lucretius seems to have used Bion as a model for the *prosopopoiia* of Nature and as a source or model elsewhere, however, there seems to be no need to postulate an intermediate source between the Roman poet and the Greek writer. That Bion is a more likely source for the poet than Epicurus in this instance, further, seems to be supported not only by Lucretius' obvious imitation of the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, but also by the fact that the Epicurean poet does not seem to be referring to suicide in 938-939 but, as Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 214) has observed, "the image is used to recommend cheerful acceptance of inevitable death", just as it also was used by Bion and later by Horace (cf. Murley, 383).[83]

Other themes and stylistic traits which connect Lucretius to the works of Bion or to the diatribe as a genre are to be found in lines 931-951. The rhetorical questions which already have been mentioned are, certainly, very important indicators of the style, and along with those questions in both Lucretius and Bion there appears that polemic tone which frequently occurs in the Cynic-Stoic genre, often in connection with rhetorical questions. *Penia*, and *Natura* in

[83] The idea of suicide does seem to appear in 943 in contrast to the theme found in 938-939. For the Epicurean views concerning suicide, cf. Bailey, 1152, who cites the *Letter to Menoeceus* 126; *Sen. Vat.* IX; Cicero *De finibus* I 19, 62, and the passage from the *Tusculans* (V 41, 118) quoted above after footnote 82.

imitation of her, go on the offensive as they pour forth such a stream of questions that the foolish men whom they are "attacking" cannot possibly manage to insert an answer, but rather must "stand convicted" of the foolishness which is described by each personification.[84] Also indicative of Lucretius' polemic tone is the use of *stulte* by *Natura* in reference to the recipient of her remarks (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 214). The combination of *prosopopoiia*, rhetorical questions, and a polemic tone is intentionally dramatic, harking back to the diatribe's emphasis upon maintaining or regaining the attention of an audience. Obvious within these rhetorical questions, further, in addition to polemicism, is their exhortative nature which is indicative of the diatribe's function of urging men to practice virtue, as defined by the speaker (cf. Oltramare, 13, on the exhortative nature of the genre). *Natura*, like *Penia*, is not merely castigating the "stupid man" for his ridiculous opinions, but she also is urging him to accept death without weeping or complaining, an approach which mitigates the negativism of pure polemic. In a similar fashion *Penia* certainly attacks the foolishness of the dissatisfied man, but she also intends for her questions to be instructive in that they show the good things which a man possesses without wealth.

Also indicative of the diatribal style within lines 931-951 is the presence of certain rhetorical figures favored by the genre, some of which also occur in Bion's *prosopopoiia*. In lines 933-934, for example, Lucretius employs anaphora, alliteration, and homoeoteleuton when *Natura* asks,

> quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quid nimis aegris
> luctibus indulges? quid mortem congemis ac fles?

Bion utilizes these same figures, although his style of rapid, brief questions varies from the Roman poet's longer ones (cf. Stork, 93). One finds in the diatribe writer's first questions, for instance, obvious anaphora with μή, homoeoteleuton with μάχῃ and στερίσκῃ (cf. Lucretius' *indulges* and *fles*), as well as with σωφροσύνης and δικαιοσύνης, and later with πίνει and ἀναμένει (line 10). Allitera-

[84] Surely, if a personified *Natura* or *Penia* actually did rise up and begin to talk, the average man, like Shakespeare's Horatio (*Hamlet* I, i) would ". . .tremble and look pale" and say,

> . . .I might not this believe
> Without the sensible and true avouch
> Of mine own eyes.

tion also occurs in the repetition of "s's" in στερίσκῃ, σωφροσύνης, and δικαιοσύνης. Examples of homoeoptoton and isocolon, other devices favored by the diatribe, appear in the Lucretian lines (935-937)

> nam si grata fuit tibi vita anteacta priorque
> et non omnia pertusum congesta quasi in vas
> commoda perfluxere atque ingrata interiere,

in which *vita anteacta* and *omnia commoda* correspond to form the figure homoeoptoton, while isocolon and homoeoteleuton are combined, with a second homoeoptoton, in line 937. The alliterative sound of "t's" also helps to make these lines memorable. One, of course, finds each of these figures in the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, as well as in other diatribal literature. Isocolon, for example, appears in the questions "μὴ σωφροσύνης;" and "μὴ δικαιοσύνης;", in the phrases ἢ οὐ μεσταὶ . . . λαχάνων and πλήρεις . . . ὕδατος (Teles, 7, 4) and elsewhere in the passage. Instances of homoeoptoton include the correspondence between μεσταί and κρῆναι (Teles, 7,5), between εὐνάς and στρωμνάς (Teles, 7, 5-6), and between ἥδιστα and ἥκιστα (Teles, 7, 9-10). To all of these figures may be added the etymological wordplay of *vitae conviva* in Lucretius 938 (cf. Stork, 79 and note 258), to which one may compare, as far as the effect upon an audience is concerned, the *paronomasia* inherent in the sound of ἥδιστα and ἥκιστα (Teles, 7, 9-10).

Other examples of these figures which have been mentioned and of other figures and devices also appear in Lucretius 931-951, and are worthy of special note. In line 942, for example, one finds what could become a textbook example of the use of isocolon and homoeoteleuton (see footnote 128 below). Lucretius writes,

> Rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,

to which one might compare, "Turpiter audes facere, nequiter studes dicere; vivis invidiose, delinquis studiose, loqueris odiose," an example of homoeoteleuton, given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV 20, 28), which also might serve as an example of isocolon. An additional and slightly similar example of homoeoteleuton, this time combined with homoeoptoton as well as isocolon,[86] appears in the question (950-951),

---

[86] Similar to isocolon, but appearing in different sentences, are the parallel phrases "eadem sunt omnia semper" (945) and "eadem tamen omnia restant"

quid respondemus, nisi iustam intendere litem
naturam et veram verbis exponere causam?

To these figures should be added the *coniunctio* (see above, after footnote 54) which is used by the poet in the line (943)

non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?,

in which *facis* occupies a medial position similar to that held by the verb in the sentence "Formae dignitas aut morbo deflorescit aut vetustate," an example of *coniunctio* provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV 27, 38). Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* also employs this figure, in the question "ἢ οὐκ ὄψον ἀδάπανον καὶ ἀτρύφερον παρασκευάζω σοι τὴν πεῖναν;" The fact that all of the figures which have been mentioned appear in both authors does not necessarily imply that Lucretius used them in his *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* only because he found them in Bion's personification of *Penia*. One rather should assume that certain rhetorical figures are characteristic not only of Bion's style, but also of the diatribal style as a whole, and that Lucretius employed them primarily because he was utilizing that style, and additionally because he was influenced by the work of Bion in general and not just by the one *prosopopoiia* which has survived.[86]

To the evidence of influence provided by the devices and figures which have been mentioned must be added a brief discussion of the topic found in the following six lines which may reflect a diatribal theme (940-945):

sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,
non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?
nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.

---

(947), which obviously provide a didactic emphasis upon Natura's contention that she can provide nothing new beyond that which already exists.

One should note here that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states (IV 20, 27) that isocolon is formed "ex pari fere numero syllabarum" and that in isocolon often "fieri potest ut non plane par numerus sit syllabarum et tamen esse videatur. . .". Thus, the isocola do not have to be exactly equal, as long as they produce the proper effect.

[86] The favorite rhetorical devices of the diatribe include anaphora, antithesis, homoeoteleuton, homoeoptoton, alliteration, isocolon, and wordplays. Cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 44 ff. and *passim*; Bultmann, 20 ff.; Hense, xcix ff. on the style of Bion; Oltramare, 14.

Clyde Murley, in "Lucretius and the History of Satire" (383), has noticed the similarity between lines 940-943 and the following fragment of Lucilius (fr. 205-207, ed. Werner Krenkel, Leiden 1970):

> nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset,
> hoc sat erat; nunc cum hoc non est, qui credimus porro
> divitias ullas animum mi explere potisse?

Both Krenkel and Murley trace Lucilius' question back to Epicurus' statement (Usener, 302, fr. 473), "ᾧ ὀλίγον οὐχ ἱκανόν, ἀλλὰ τούτῳ γε οὐδὲν ἱκανόν." A closer parallel to the Epicurean fragment, however, seems to be provided by the remark (fr. 568, Krenkel),

> denique uti stulto nil sit satis, omnia cum sint,

found in book 19 of Lucilius' satires. Further, this Lucilian line with its reference to the *stulto* and emphasis upon the impossibility of fulfilling the wishes of such a person seems to be related to the Lucretian lines quoted above, specifically to lines 941-942 and 944-945, and also to *Natura*'s use of *stulte* in 939, a term which can be assumed to apply also to the man addressed in 940-945.

On the basis of the similarities of thought and form found in Lucilius fr. 568, Epicurus fr. 473, and Lucretius 940-945, one might assume that Epicurus was the common source of both of the Latin writers, although Lucretius certainly could have known either of the Lucilian passages quoted above. One cannot overlook the fact, however, that the idea expressed by Lucilius in fragment 568, as Fiske (192) has observed, "is clearly animated by the same Cynic-Stoic doctrine" as is the diatribe Περὶ αὐταρκείας of Teles, which contains Bionean fragments, and attacks "the vice of discontent with one's lot, μεμψιμοιρία, a state of mind which finds one of its most striking illustrations in the insatiable love of wealth, φιλοπλουτία." An example of this theme is found in Teles' Περὶ αὐταρκείας (11, 5-6, cited by Fiske, 192), when the author states, "ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσιν, ὅταν καὶ τρυφῇ πολὺ διδῶμεν, καὶ τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι . . . αἱ κρίνωμεν καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἔσχατόν [τι] τῶν κακῶν." [87] The diatribe writer then adds the advice (11, 7-10), "ἐὰν δὲ ποιήσῃ καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς καταφρονοῦντά τινα, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πόνους μὴ διαβεβλημένον, καὶ πρὸς δόξαν καὶ ἀδοξίαν ἴσως ἔχοντα, καὶ τὸν θάνατον μὴ φοβούμενον, ὅ τι ἂν θέλῃς ἐξέσται σοι ἀνωδύνῳ

[87] On the lacuna between ἐργάζεσθαι and αἱ, cf. Hense's apparatus, 11.

ὄντι ποιεῖν." Lucretius' remarks in 941-943 and 944-945 seem to include at least the themes of "μεμψιμοιρία" and "φιλοπλουτία" found within these Teles fragments and, additionally, in their concern with death seem connected with the idea of death as the ἔσχατον τῶν κακῶν, a concept which both Teles or Bion and Lucretius frequently combat. It does not seem to be impossible that the Epicurean poet could have been familiar with these or similar remarks belonging to the diatribal tradition especially since they may have been a part of the same diatribe in which the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* appears.[88] Lucretius, therefore, quite possibly used Bion or his imitators as a source for lines 940-945, perhaps in addition to an Epicurean work expressing the views found in fragment 302 above,[89] or perhaps as his only source.

Now that the relationship between Lucretius 931-951, and the diatribes of Bion has been explored, we may proceed to an examination of the second part of the *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* (952-977), which also owes an obvious debt to the diatribal tradition. In this section the poet once again sets the stage for his personification and then allows *Natura* to begin her second attack, as the following lines indicate:

grandior hic vero si iam seniorque queratur
atque obitum lamentetur miser amplius aequo,
non merito inclamet magis et voce increpet acri?
'aufer abhinc lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas.
omnia perfunctus vitai praemia marces.
sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,
imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita
et nec opinanti mors ad caput adstitit ante
quam satur ac plenus possis discedere rerum.
nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte
aequo animoque agedum †magnis† concede: necessest.'

[88] These remarks may be the work of Teles, but, since they are found within the same fragment in which the *prosopopoiia* by Bion appears, and since Teles was heavily influenced by Bion, one might assume that they reflect at least the views of Bion, if not his actual words. We must, of course, allow for the possibility that Lucretius knew Bion through the work of Teles and therefore might even have known Teles' Περὶ αὐταρκείας. Lucretius does seem closer here to Bion-Teles than to Lucilius, fr. 568, a fact which would seem to indicate that both poets independently used a Cynic source, or that Lucilius followed Epicurus.

[89] See also Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 215, who notes concerning line 945, "there is also a hint in what follows of the Epicurean doctrine that pleasure does not increase with duration." Cf. Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 177, who mentions *Kuriai Doxai* XIX.

iure, ut opinor, agat, iure increpet inciletque.
cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest;
nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra.
materies opus est ut crescant postera saecla;
quae tamen omnia te vita perfuncta sequentur;
nec minus ergo ante haec quam tu cecidere, cadentque.
sic alid ex alio numquam desistet oriri
vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.
respice item quam nil ad nos anteacta vetustas
temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante.
hoc igitur speculum nobis natura futuri
temporis exponit post mortem denique nostram.
numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?

The "victim" of the attack this time is, as the poet indicates, the old man who laments his coming death. Using a rhetorical question Lucretius asks indignantly whether Nature would not correctly "inclamet et voce increpet acri," in view of such ridiculous behavior. Lines 955-962 then comprise the second *prosopopoiia* in which the poet abandons the rhetorical questions found in his previous use of the device and, instead, mounts a direct attack with the imperatives which also are used frequently within the diatribal style,[90] and which are combined here with the derogatory *baratre*, corresponding to *stulte* in 939 (see above after footnote 84). One immediately notices the thematic correspondences between the lines which follow these opening imperatives (956-960) and sections of *Natura*'s attack in her first appearance. Lines 957-958,

sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,
imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita,

for example, certainly reflect the "μεμψιμοιρία" and "φιλοπλουτία" in lines 940-943,

sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne.

Further, the idea of going away from life as from a banquet (938) seems to reappear in the "satur ac plenus discedere rerum" of line 960. Since these topics, as was indicated above, can be traced to the diatribal tradition, one might assume that Lucretius found the

[90] See Bultmann, 15.

prototype for his attack upon the foolish old man within a representative work of the Cynic-Stoic genre. Such an assumption seems to be strengthened by Bion's frequent use of old age as a theme (cf. Teles, 8, 6-8 and 10, 6 ff.) [91] and by the connection of old age with the idea of contentment with one's lot in the remark (Teles, 10, 6-7; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 180), "καὶ σὺ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα χρῶ. γέρων γέγονας· μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου," which could indicate a source for Lucretius' combination of the theme of dissatisfaction (957-960) with the concept of acting according to one's age, expressed as (961),

nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte.

Also possibly involved in *Natura*'s remarks are more general diatribal themes, such as those which Oltramare lists as "il faut *se contenter de ce qu'on a* (52, theme 41, and 113: cf. theme 46) and "les *avares* ne savent pas profiter de ce qu'ils possèdent" (54, theme 46a; from Teles, 35, 4). Lucretius' old man certainly has not known how to profit from what he possesses and always has been greedy for "quod abest," as is evident in 957-958.

This desire for what is absent reminds one of Aristotle's comment that the old are "φιλόζωοι, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀπόντος εἶναι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ οὗ δὲ ἐνδεεῖς, τούτου μάλιστα ἐπιθυμεῖν," (*Ars Rhetorica*, II, 1389b 34). Lucretius' statements obviously go beyond the idea of greed for life and include the notion of desire for more of life's "good things" (Bailey, 351), but the concept of desire for what one lacks, expressed by the poet in 957, does correspond to part of Aristotle's remarks. This resemblance, however, does not necessarily indicate that Lucretius drew upon the *Ars Rhetorica* for his depiction of the faults of the old man, for the commonplace nature of the theme in question precludes the necessity for a definite source. Of importance for our investigation, however, is the fact that the connection of age and the desire for the absent is found within the rhetorical

---

[91] See also Diogenes Laertius IV 48 and Hans Herter, "Demokrit über das Alter," *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Neue Folge I (1975; *Festschrift Ernst Siegmann*), 90. I want to thank Professor Herter for kindly calling my attention to this study. One cannot discount the possible influence of Democritus on Bion, a factor which could tie Lucretius to the Epicurean tradition at second hand (through Bion), as well as at first hand (through Epicurus or Epicurean writings or the works of Democritus himself).

tradition, in which it may have become a *topos*. Further, we should not forget that Bion was a student of Theophrastus (Diogenes Laertius IV 52), the pupil of Aristotle, and that, therefore, the diatribist may have known Aristotle's description of old age, or a Peripatetic discussion of the topic, and may have derived one or more of the themes found in his lectures from one of these sources. Aristotle's views then could have influenced Lucretius at second hand.

One cannot ignore the fact, however, that there are Epicurean fragments containing themes somewhat similar to those found in *Natura*'s attack in 955-962. As Woltjer has noted (*Lucretii Philosophia*, 171), for example, Epicurus himself warned, "Γεγόναμεν ἅπαξ, δὶς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι γενέσθαι· δεῖ δὲ τὸν αἰῶνα μηκέτ' εἶναι· σὺ δὲ οὐκ ὢν τῆς αὔριον <κύριος> ἀναβάλλῃ τὸ χαῖρον· ὁ δὲ βίος μελλησμῷ παραπόλλυται καὶ εἷς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἀσχολούμενος ἀποθνήσκει." [92] This warning possibly corresponds to Lucretius' remarks in 957-958 (cf. Bailey, 1154) with their emphasis on the old man's scornful attitude toward "praesentia," which caused his life to be *imperfecta* and *ingrata*. In the Epicurean fragment, however, is lacking the theme of "μεμψιμοιρία" and its accompanying greed which seems to be evident in the Lucretian lines (see also Kenney, 217). Perhaps the poet has combined an Epicurean sentiment with a diatribal topic, as he seems to have done before (see above after footnote 76). One should note also that the idea of always seeking something beyond what one has is a common topic found outside of Epicurean doctrine and the diatribe. Plautus, for instance, writes in his *Pseudolus* (685),

Certa amittimus, dum incerta petimus,

while a fable of Aesop depicts a dog which, confused by its own image in a stream, dropped the meat which it was carrying and vainly tried to get the meat carried by the "other" dog, thereby losing something real in the vain pursuit of something *incertum*.[93] The proverbial nature of this theme, however, connects it closely with the diatribal tradition, which frequently used proverbs and fables to convey a message, and therefore should not be considered

---

[92] *Sententiae Vaticanae* XIV, from *Epicurus, the Extant Remains*, ed. C. Bailey (Oxford 1926), 106-108.

[93] Cf. Phaedrus I, 4. Both of these uses of the theme are listed by Otto, 81; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 217.

a reason for excluding the diatribe as a possible source for the Roman poet. Another theme found in this Lucretian passage and in Epicurean literature is that of death coming upon one before one feels ready for it. Philodemus, for instance, in the *De Morte* (XXXVII, 18 ff.; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 180), writes, "τὸ τοίνυν συνα[ρ]πάζεσθα[ι] θανάτου προσπίπτοντ[ο]ς, ὡς ἀπροσ[δο]κήτου [τ]ινὸς καὶ π[α]ραδόξου συνα[ν]τῶντο[ς], ἡμ[εῖ]ν [μὲ]ν [οὐχί, γί]νετα[ι δ]ὲ περὶ τοὺς πλείστο[υ]ς, ἀγνοοῦν[τ]ας ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐφ[ήμ]ερός [ἐσ]τι πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ [τε]λευτήν, κ.τ.λ." To this remark one might add the fragments of Epicurus which state "Πᾶς ὥσπερ ἄρτι γεγονὼς ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπέρχεται" (*Sent. Vat.* LX; cf. Bailey, 1154) [94] and "τοῦ γεγονότος ἀμνήμων ἀγαθοῦ γέρων τήμερον γεγένηται" (*Sent. Vat.* XIX; cf. Bailey, 1154). These statements may be commonplaces, but they are not at odds with the view that the good Epicurean must be ready for death whenever it comes (cf. Metrodorus in Bailey's ed. of Epicurus, 112, fr. XLVII; Epicurus, *Sent. Vat.* XLVIII). Consideration of these last themes concerning death and of the diatribal themes which were mentioned above in connection with 957 ff. and which are not in the Epicurean fragments, then, leads us to conclude that Lucretius has taken over topics which he found in the diatribes of Bion or his imitators and has combined them with Epicurean doctrine to create a composite picture of the old man who was never content in life and who is now urged to stop his foolish behavior and to die *aequo animo*.[95]

In support of the idea that the diatribe did have an influence upon the themes in lines 952-962 one may cite the various traits

[94] On the interpretation of this saying, cf. Bailey's edition of Epicurus, 385. Bailey writes that "Usener compares Lucr. iii. 972, 973 . . ., and takes it to mean that our condition after death will be as it was before birth, i.e. we shall feel and know nothing — but it is very difficult to extract this from the Greek. Bignone takes it to refer to the accompaniments of this life, 'We brought nothing into this world and it is certain that we shall take nothing out." According to Bailey, however, "if one looks simply at the Greek text it surely refers to the brevity of life and the little that any man accomplishes in it."

Seneca's interpretation of this fragment is discussed by W. Schmid in "Eine falsche Epikurdeutung Senecas und seine Praxis der erbauenden Lesung (Epic. Gnom. Vat. 60)," *Acme, Annali della Facoltà di Filosofia e Lettere dell' Università Statale di Milano* 8 (1955), 119-129. I wish to thank Professor Hans Herter, who kindly called my attention to this study.

[95] Once again the diatribal style of this *prosopopoiia* and Lucretius' obvious familiarity with diatribal literature (which is proved by the style and content of III, 931 ff. and of several *prooemia*) must lead one to assume that Lucretius rather than his Epicurean source has produced this mixture.

generally found within the Cynic-Stoic genre which also make an appearance within this passage. The importance of the *prosopopoiia* within the diatribal tradition already has been mentioned above, and it may be assumed that Lucretius' double usage of personification owes its inspiration to the employment of that device by Bion or his imitators. A second strong indicator of diatribal influence is the presence of an imaginary interlocutor (cf. Schrijvers, 285), represented by the poet's query (952-954),

> grandior hic vero si iam seniorque queratur
> atque obitum lamentetur miser amplius aequo,
> non merito inclamet magis et voce increpet acri?

Lucretius employs his interlocutor here as, for example, he did in lines 870 ff., where the imaginary or hypothetical "opponent" was described in terms of his fears and complaints but did not speak directly, or in III 41 ff., where the poet depicted the ridiculous actions of the man who claimed to be unafraid of death, and included the opinions of that man, introducing them by *ferunt*. As has been noted before, this method of using an interlocutor to present an opinion for the author to demolish must be considered the equivalent of the diatribal φησί, and, therefore, must be taken as strong evidence of the poet's use of the diatribal style. In this instance (952 ff.) Lucretius has assigned the task of refutation through ridicule to his personified *Natura*, in contrast to his usual practice of conducting his own refutation. The demolishment of the foolish attitudes of an opponent generally is pursued with a polemical tone, often combined with *spoudaiogeloion*, a combination which is in evidence in 952 ff. as the personified *Natura* both attacks and ridicules the old man. Any humor in 952-962, however, is primarily of a bitter type, producing at most a smile as the audience recognizes familiar traits and realizes their foolishness. Polemicism, on the other hand, begins with the apparently angry commands (955),

> aufer abhinc lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas,

and continues into *Natura*'s final behest (961-962),

> Nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte
> aequo animoque agedum †magnis† concede: necessest.

The frequency of such imperatives, as well as their polemical tone, within the diatribe already has been mentioned (see above at

footnote 90), and one should note additionally the brevity of the sentences containing these imperatives and of the other sentences within the *prosopopoiia.* Such brevity and its concomitant lack of periodic sentences is common within the diatribe (see chapter I, after footnote 16, and Norden, I, 130),[96] as one must realize upon examining the style of passages quoted from Bion and Teles within this study, and may be a further indication of the diatribal nature, and inspiration, of 952-962.

To those traits which have been noted may be added the possibly proverbial nature of lines 957-958 which was discussed above. Even if these lines were not inspired by a common saying, the fact that they sound like a maxim or pithy saying must connect them with the diatribal habit of couching its message in phrases drawn from proverbial lore or created after the style of maxims. Additional evidence of influence from the Cynic-Stoic genre is provided by the presence of various rhetorical figures favored by the diatribe. Homoeoteleuton, as defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV 20, 28; "similes exitus"), for example, appears in the *queratur* and *lamentetur* of 952-953, in the *inclamet* and *increpet* of 954, and in the *mitte* and *concede* of 961-962. To these must be added the examples of homoeoptoton which include *lacrimas* and *querellas* in 955, and *praesentia, imperfecta,* and *ingrata vita* in 957-958. Isocolon also is in evidence in the cola "non merito inclamet magis" and "et voce increpet acri" of line 954 and in the "aufer abhinc lacrimas" and "et compesce querellas" of 955. Further, the use of asyndeton in 957 and of an apparent wordplay involving the similarity of *aves* and *abest* is an additional indication of the rhetorical nature of the poet's style within the *prosopopoiia.* Two final figures worthy of mention are *transiectio* and *coniunctio,* which obviously are utilized for purposes of emphasis. The first of these finds expression in the separation of *omnia* and *praemia* in 956, of *imperfecta* and *vita* in 958, and of *aliena* and *omnia* in 961. *Coniunctio* appears only once, in the positioning of *elapsast* in 958, where the poet wishes to stress the fact that the old man's life has slipped away from him. The combination of all of these figures within the brief *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* in 952-962 seems to indicate that Lucretius has employed a very rhetorical style

---

[96] Cf. Stork, 86, on the imperatives and 93, where she writes that "im zweiten Teil der Rede, V. 955, der im ganzen stärker aggressiv wirkt, sind die Sätze kürzer oder wenigstens parataktisch verbunden, in V. 957-960."

intentionally, since he knew that such a style was in keeping with the diatribal form which he was imitating. Further, the use of these figures, of a *prosopopoiia*, of an interlocutor, *spoudaiogeloion*, and a simple style, must lead one to the conclusion that the diatribal influence upon lines 952-962 is obvious and that those themes mentioned above which can be related to the diatribe but not directly to Epicureanism must be assumed to have been derived by the Epicurean poet from a diatribal source which also influenced his style.

Lucretius concludes his *prosopopoiia* with the remark that *Natura* (963)

iure, ut opinor, agat, iure increpet inciletque,

which, like the conclusion of his first personification (950-951), harks back in its reintroduction of the author, who expresses his view of the remarks made within the *prosopopoiia*, to the style of the concluding statement of Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, in which the δοκῶ must be considered the equivalent of Lucretius' *ut opinor*. One also should note within this sentence the poet's use of emphatic anaphora (*iure* . . . *iure*) and asyndeton, and the intentional similarity of *increpet* and *incilet*, all of which figures are employed by the diatribe and provide further confirmation of Lucretius' continued use of the style of that genre within the lines which follow his second *prosopopoiia* (964-977).

After concluding his personification of *Natura* the poet takes up the idea expressed in the "concede: necessest" and expands it by explaining (964-966),

cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest;
nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra.

Lucretius informs his audience, in other words, that "the material of one generation is required for the production of another," (Bailey, 1155) and that, therefore, no one is committed to the abyss or to Tartarus, since (967)

materies opus est ut crescant postera saecla.[97]

[97] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 219, observes that "by saying that nobody is sent down to Tartarus L. kills two birds (if not three) with one stone: he states the dogma that matter cannot be annihilated (cf. 967 n.) in terms that bring it home to the individual, who is still being addressed (968-9); he also gets in a hit at popular notions of death (which are implied to be absurdly wasteful) and hints at the subject of his next paragraph."

Further, according to the poet, these *postera saecla* in their turn will complete their life spans and then die, giving up their atoms just as past generations have (968-969), in fulfillment of the rule which stipulates (971),

> vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.

In these lines which have just been paraphrased and quoted Lucretius obviously has expounded Epicurean doctrine, since he is alluding not only to the total dissolution of body and soul at death, a necessary occurrence if atoms are to be "reused," but also to the idea which he expressed in I 262-264 (cited by Bailey, 1155), when he wrote,

> haud igitur penitus pereunt quaecumque videntur,
> quando alid ex alio reficit natura nec ullam
> rem gigni patitur nisi morte adiuta aliena.

The legal imagery with which the poet expresses himself in 971 (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, 155 and Bailey, 1156), however, seems to reflect a commonplace of consolatory or diatribal literature. The idea of life as a loan is a theme found, for example, in the *consolatio* section of *epicedia* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, 152; Stork, 102), as well as in Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* (I 39, 93), where the author comments that Nature "dedit usuram vitae tamquam pecuniae nulla praestituta die" (Bailey, 1156; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 220). Further, tomb inscriptions such as (Lattimore, 170; cf. Esteve-Forriol, 153)

> ἀλλ' ἀποδοὺς τὸ δάνιον πεπόρευμε· ταῦτα πάντα κόνις,

and (Lattimore, 171)

> debitum reddidit,

also convey the idea of life as a debt which must be repaid by death. It is interesting to note concerning these inscriptions that, as Lattimore (171) has stated, they are descriptive rather than consolatory, a distinction which could be applied to Lucretius' use of the image which serves to illustrate his point concerning the function of death. To these examples of the theme in consolatory literature and in tomb inscriptions must be added the Bionean fragment (Stobaeus *Flor.* 105, 56), "τὰ χρήματα τοῖς πλουσίοις ἡ Τύχη οὐ δεδώρηκεν, ἀλλὰ δεδάνεικεν," which often is cited as

representative of the same commonplace as that mentioned above,[98] although, of course, Bion is referring to the fact that Fortune only lends, but does not give, advantages such as wealth, and he is not dealing specifically with the topic of life itself as a loan. Obviously the commonplace nature of Lucretius' remark in 971 prevents an absolute determination of a source which the poet might have used for it. The style of the Bionean fragment is close to that of Lucretius' statement, a factor which, in view of the poet's use of Bion in 931-963, might incline one to postulate a diatribal source, but, because of the frequency of the image's use, one cannot prove conclusively that the Roman poet relied upon the diatribe writer for this particular theme.

Following his remarks concerning life as a loan, Lucretius returns to the analogy which he developed in 832 ff., "proving" that the time after one's death will be just as meaningless as the time before one's birth (see above after footnote 5) and then adds the rhetorical question, which recurs to his discussion in 904 ff. and 921 ff.,

> numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
> quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?[99]

The importance of the analogy and its presence in consolatory literature has been discussed above, as has the similarity of the thought to a fragment of Bion preserved in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* in which the diatribe writer observes that sleep and the time before one is born are the "rehearsals" for death (cf. above after footnote 76; Oltramare, 48 (theme 25b) and 113 on Lucretius). The combination of the idea of one's insensibility before birth with the concept that death produces a loss of consciousness that resembles sleep may represent the poet's habit of alluding to topics which he has discussed previously, a habit with an obviously didactic purpose. Because of the use of Bion in 931 ff., however, one must assume that Lucretius also could have referred in 972 ff. to the periods of unconsciousness connected with sleep and with the time "quam nascimur ante," because he found a similar reference in the works of Bion or in sayings attributed to that "philosopher."

---

[98] Cf. Bailey, 1156; Ernout and Robin, II, 155; Heinze, *Lucretius III*, 182; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 220.

[99] On these lines cf. Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia*, 77-78, who refers to the similar theme in Plutarch's *Cons. ad Apollon.* 15, tracing it back to Crantor.

Certainly Bion's "τόν τε πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι χρόνον . . ." (*Gnomol. Vat.*, 160) bears a strong resemblance to Lucretius' (972-973)

> . . . vetustas
> temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante,

and the poet's combination of two analogies which he had used previously could have been inspired by a similar connection made by Bion.[100] Further, the verbal similarities between Lucretius and Bion in this case and in line 971, which was discussed above, seem to indicate that the poet was influenced by the eclectic "philosopher" rather than by consolatory literature or by an Epicurean source in his employment of both topics.

Additional evidence for the influence of Bion or his imitators seems to be provided by the style which the poet adopts in lines 964-977. After he has concluded his second *prosopopoiia* with the remark in 963, Lucretius, as was noted above, expounds in a moralizing fashion upon the idea expressed by the "concede: necessest" in 962, developing that theme by means of explanation and an analogy and then attaching in a loose fashion the related idea of the nature of the unconsciousness which comes with death. This type of expansion must remind one of the technique utilized by Teles (probably following a method employed by his mentor Bion) at the conclusion of his quotation of Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*. After the remark "ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ <ἂν> δοκῶ ἄφωνος γενέσθαι," which may represent Bion's conclusion, Teles launches into a moralizing discussion of the tendency to blame one's difficulties or misfortunes upon old age, poverty, a chance meeting, the day, the season, or one's place (8, 6-8). This discussion is connected to what precedes it not only by the brief reference to poverty but also by the theme of one's inability to accept one's lot, a theme which harks back to the idea of dissatisfaction which produced the outrage of *Penia*. Teles conducts his discussion by means of an anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope and two similes, attributed to Bion, the first of which mentions the proper way to handle animals, and instructs one concerning the management of one's difficulties, while the second tells of sailors who

---

100 Oltramare, 113, observes concerning 972-977, "souvent aussi il se sert des comparaisons diatribiques de la mort avec le sommeil et avec l'éternité qui précéda notre naissance (th. 25b)." Oltramare's theme 25b is based upon Bion's remark recorded by the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*.

learn to adapt themselves to the changes of the wind and the sea, even as one must adapt oneself to one's circumstances.[101]

Throughout this passage which has just been paraphrased the connecting thread is the idea of independence (αὐτάρκεια), which is the very antithesis of that dissatisfaction from which a man must liberate himself. If one does not recognize the connection between dissatisfaction and "αὐτάρκεια", however, the section of the diatribe in which *Penia* appears and that in which the two similes occur seem to be unconnected or at best joined in a very loose fashion. One sees this "looseness" to a lesser degree in the Lucretian lines, but the connection between lines 972-977 and the section which precedes them (964-971) does seem to be nonexistent until one recognizes that in mentioning the "vetustas temporis aeterni" the poet is continuing the idea of the old making way for the new, stressing in this case the time before the present in which the hypothetical old man and the audience live. The connection is loose, but no looser than that employed by Teles.[102] In view of the similarity of arrangement, consisting of *prosopopoiia*, conclusion, moralizing comment, and analogies, one perhaps may assume that the rather free form of the diatribe, with its tendency to resemble a medley of thoughts and devices, has had some effect upon Lucretius in lines 964-977, although the poet's own tendency toward "suspension of thought" also must be taken into account (cf. Bailey, 165 ff.).

Unlike Bion-Teles, however, Lucretius does preserve some semblance of a formal rhetorical argument. Thus, the remark,

> iure, ut opinor, agat, iure increpet inciletque,

serves as a *propositio*, followed by its reason (*ratio*) (964-966),

> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest:
> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra.

The two themes found in this reason, i.e. the idea of the old giving way to the new and the denial of punishment or terrors after death, are included in the combination of proofs and embellishment

---

[101] Regarding this section, cf. Dudley, *Cynicism*, 66-67; Wallach, Dissertation, 46-47.

[102] This passage in Teles with which I have compared the Lucretian lines is not necessarily Lucretius' model. I have chosen it for use as a comparison, since it contains a *prosopopoiia*, and since it seems to be a typical example of the style of Bion and Teles.

(*exornatio*) which appears in 967-977. The first "proof" expresses the need for material to form *postera saecla* which, in their turn, will "pass away" to make room for the new. An *exornatio* composed of a "proverbial" saying follows (970-971). In his second proof the poet calls upon his listener to look at the "past ages of everlasting time" (Bailey, 353), which Nature presents as a *speculum* of the time after death. An *amplificatio* in the form of rhetorical questions then concludes the argument by stressing that one has nothing to fear after death, thus indirectly referring to the concept expressed in 966. Here, as in 870-893, Lucretius prefers to conclude his "argument" with a dramatic touch, in this case with rhetorical questions, rather than with a formal, summarizing conclusion (*conplexio*).

The use of some sort of rhetorical argument (or of what sounds like one) and a looseness of construction are two characteristics of the diatribal style, and they are not the only possibly diatribal elements in 964-977. Also indicative of the influence of the Cynic-Stoic genre are the brief, simple sentences which the poet employs throughout this passage (see above at footnote 77), such as, for example, lines 972-973,

> respice item quam nil ad nos anteacta vetustas
> temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante,

which also reflect the diatribal style through their use of an imperative (see above at footnote 90). Several of Lucretius' sentences, further, resemble maxims, another favorite device of the diatribe. For example, the poet writes in 964-965,

> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest,

expressing important Epicurean doctrine in a fashion which is easy to understand and to remember, and which has the sound of a proverb, such as Terence's "omnium rerum, heus, vicissitudost," (*Eunuchus* 276) or Propertius' later "omnia vertuntur" (II 8, 7; cf. Otto, 255), detailing the inevitability of change. Equally proverbial is the remark (970-971):

> sic alid ex alio numquam desistet oriri
> vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu,

whose probable origin has been discussed above (see after footnote 97). To the other traits which have been mentioned must be

added the use of a *somotopoiia* of nature in the remark (974-975),[103]

> hoc igitur speculum nobis natura futuri
> temporis exponit post mortem denique nostram.

This *somotopoiia* is followed by the rhetorical question,

> numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
> quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?,

which is noteworthy for its anaphora, in the repetition *numquid* and *num*, asyndeton, in the lack of connection between the three phrases, isocolon, in the similar length of each phrase, and, finally, possible wordplay with *omni* and *somno*. Additional examples of some of these rhetorical figures appear in the anaphora of *nec* in line 966,

> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra,

and the asyndeton of 971,

> vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu,

which also features chiasmus and *coniunctio*. Another chiasmus is created by the position of the verbs *cedit* and *necessest* in 964-965,

> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest.

Verb placement again is important in 966,

> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra,

where the figure *adiunctio* is used (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 27, 38). All of these figures and devices, when considered as a unit, are indicative of the rhetorical and diatribal nature of 964-977, and may be taken as further proof of the poet's conscious use of a style influenced by, or at least compatible with, the Cynic-Stoic genre, which he has combined with his didactic poetry and Epicurean philosophy.

After the long section which includes his two *prosopopoiiai* and the remarks which follow them the poet adds a passage which provides moralizing interpretations of the stories concerning famous malefactors allegedly punished in the underworld, a passage which is linked to the preceding one by the reference to *Tartara atra* in line 966 (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 219; Bailey, 1155). The

---

[103] For the term *somotopoiia*, cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 158 and footnote 344; Servius, on *Aeneid* IV 174 ff.

poet introduces his account with a statement of his theme, noting (978-979),

> Atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo
> prodita sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis.

Lucretius' first example is Tantalus, concerning whom the poet declares (980-983),

> nec miser impendens magnum timet aere saxum
> Tantalus, ut famast, cassa formidine torpens;
> sed magis in vita divum metus urget inanis
> mortalis casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors.

Following Tantalus, who represents fear of the gods or superstition (West, 98), appears Tityos, whose difficulties symbolize "irrational desire" (Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 223) and who is discussed as follows (984-994):

> nec Tityon volucres ineunt Acherunte iacentem
> nec quod sub magno scrutentur pectore quicquam
> perpetuam aetatem possunt reperire profecto.
> quamlibet immani proiectu corporis exstet,
> qui non sola novem dispessis iugera membris
> obtineat, sed qui terrai totius orbem,
> non tamen aeternum poterit perferre dolorem
> nec praebere cibum proprio de corpore semper.
> sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem
> quem volucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
> aut alia quavis scindunt cuppedine curae.

Lucretius continues his catalogue of famous malefactors with Sisyphus, the representative of "political failure" (West, 101), and writes (995 ff.),

> Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est
> qui petere a populo fascis saevasque securis
> imbibit et semper victus tristisque recedit.
> nam petere imperium quod inanest nec datur umquam,
> atque in eo semper durum sufferre laborem,
> hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte
> saxum quod tamen <e> summo iam vertice rursum
> volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

The Danaids, used as "a type of ingratitude" (Kenney, 227), or perhaps of dissatisfaction (Oltramare, 112), also make an appearance within this section of book III, when the poet observes (1003-1010),

deinde animi ingratam naturam pascere semper
atque explere bonis rebus satiareque numquam,
quod faciunt nobis annorum tempora, circum
cum redeunt fetusque ferunt variosque lepores,
nec tamen explemur vitai fructibus umquam,
hoc, ut opinor, id est, aevo florente puellas
quod memorant laticem petusum congerere in vas,
quod tamen expleri nulla ratione potestur.

Next, after dismissing Cerberus, the Furies, and Tartarus with the flat statement (1011-1013),

Cerberus et Furiae iam vero et lucis egestas,
Tartarus horriferos eructans faucibus aestus,
qui neque sunt usquam nec possunt esse profecto,

Lucretius concludes his allegorical section with the explanation of the reason for the existence of myths concerning punishment. Thus, according to the poet (1014-1023),

. . . metus in vita poenarum pro male factis
est insignibus insignis, scelerisque luella,
carcer et horribilis de saxo iactu' deorsum,
verbera carnifices robur pix lammina taedae;
quae tamen etsi absunt, at mens sibi conscia factis
praemetuens adhibet stimulos torretque flagellis,
nec videt interea qui terminus esse malorum
possit nec quae sit poenarum denique finis
atque eadem metuit magis haec ne in morte gravescant.
hic Acherusia fit stultorum denique vita.

The tradition behind Lucretius' use of these allegories has been a source of some controversy. Richard Heinze (*Lucretius III*, 184; cf. Bailey, 1158; Konstan, 23), for example, has made the following comments concerning this passage:

> wohl aber scheint mir die Art, wie L. hier die Hadesstrafen behandelt, in eine epikureische Trostschrift nicht hineinzupassen. Es ist von der Bekämpfung der Furcht ein weiter Schritt zur allegorischen Deutung der Strafen auf die selbstverschuldeten Leiden dieses Lebens wie sie L. giebt.

Further, according to Heinze, who mentions the moralizing use of Tantalus in Teles (34, 9 ff.), the form to which Lucretius' allegories are most similar "ist dem moralphilosophischen Tractat wie der moralphilosophischen Dichtung, die von Lastern und Fehlern abschrecken will (s. auch zu 1003), gleich angemessen." Bailey

(1157; cited by Konstan, 24), however, has observed that "the scorn of the legends of Acheron, though it does not appear in the extant writings of Epicurus, was clearly traditional in the Epicurean teaching." As proof for his contention Bailey cites Diogenes of Oenoanda (Chilton, fr. 14), who claims that stories concerning Tantaluses and Tityoses do not frighten him, and Seneca (*Epistulae Morales* XXIV, 18, ed. Reynolds), who declares, "non sum tam ineptus ut Epicuream cantilenam hoc loco persequar et dicam vanos esse inferorum metus, nec Ixionem rota volvi nec saxum umeris Sisyphi trudi in adversum nec ullius viscera et renasci posse cotidie et carpi: nemo tam puer est ut Cerberum timeat et tenebras et larvalem habitum nudis ossibus cohaerentium." Further, Democritus, whom Epicurus might have followed, wrote that (Diels, fr. 297; quoted by Bailey, 1158) some men, ignorant of the διάλυσιν of their mortal nature and cognisant of "evil-doing" in life," live in fear and create ψεύδεα concerning the time μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν. None of these passages, however, bears out Bailey's contention that (1158) "the allegorical interpretation of the legends is also derived from Epicurus himself," for proof of an allegorical interpretation is missing.[104] The only text cited by Bailey which does mention allegory is Lactantius' (*Div. Inst.* VII, 7.13) remark, "Epicurus erravit qui poetarum id esse figmentum putavit et illas inferorum poenas quae ferantur in hac esse vita interpretatus est." Lactantius, of course, is quite late (3rd century A.D.), and, as Heinze has observed (184, note 1), actually tells one nothing, "denn bei dem bekannten Verhältniss des Kirchenvaters zu Lucrez ist es durchaus glaublich, dass hier einfach der Meister statt des Schülers genannt wird." Even if Lactantius did not confuse the two, it is not impossible that his remark represents a later trend in Epicureanism, which, despite its conservative nature, could have adopted, as Lucretius may have done, the allegorical methods employed by other philosophies (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, 157).

Lactantius and the other ancient sources cited by Bailey, then, cannot be taken as convincing proof that Epicurus employed allegorical interpretations in order to explain away the stories of famous sinners in the underworld. By the same token one cannot use an *argumentum ex silentio* and assume that, since none of the

[104] The Democritean one does seem to connect one's present actions and fears with the creation of stories concerning Hades, but a definite reference to allegory does not seem to be included. Cf. Konstan, 25-26.

fragments of Epicurus mentions such allegories, therefore they were not employed by him. An attempt to disprove the legends concerning the underworld certainly would have been in keeping with the philosopher's attempt to disprove the myths concerning the gods, and especially concerning the astral gods, since all of these legends and myths were a source of fear.[105] Epicurus' method for dispelling such fears, further, was to provide an explanation of the true nature of the gods, of the stars, and of natural phenomena in general, based upon the atomic theory, and thus to destroy men's fears by showing that they were groundless (cf. *Kuriai Doxai* XII). Such explanations, of course, were not dependent upon allegorical expressions, which would have clouded the issue, and which, indeed, would seem to violate those principles of clear expression based upon attention to "τὸ πρῶτον ἐννόημα καθ' ἕκαστον φθόγγον", which the philosopher mentioned in his *Letter to Herodotus* (section 38). Rational explanations (which must be what Bailey means by "allegorical interpretation") of the legends dealing with punishment after death would have been in keeping with the philosopher's methods of explaining away the common fears of mankind, especially if Epicurus, like Democritus, attempted to show that such legends were the products of guilty imaginations and, in doing so, related specific legends to specific types of crimes.[106] Such a use of legend obviously would not be in violation of Epicurus' rules of clarity, since it would be explaining away mythological trappings which concealed a glimpse of human nature. Possibly one can see a similar process at work in the use of the myth of Phaethon in Lucretius V 396 ff. (cf. West, 103), or in the description of the rise of civilization (V 925 ff.), which provides a "scientific" account devoid of, and indeed in opposition to, any reference to the

[105] Cf. A. J. Festugière, *Epicurus and his Gods*, tr. C. W. Chilton, (Oxford 1955), 51-72 and 73-93; B. Farrington, *The Faith of Epicurus* (London 1967, rep. 1969), 123; F. Solmsen, "Epicurus and Cosmological Heresies," in *Kleine Schriften*, I (Hildesheim 1968), 461-483.

On the reasons for the conception of monsters, cf. Dietrich Lemke, *Die Theologie Epikurs, Versuch einer Rekonstruction* (Zetemata 57; München 1973), 33, and Lucretius IV 732-738.

[106] Cf. Konstan's discussion of Epicurean psychology, 20-27; Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 181 (quoted by Konstan, 24). This is perhaps similar to the type of rationalization mentioned by Lactantius. See also *Kuriai Doxai* XXXIV and XXXV (cited by Bailey, 1164), which deal with the problem of a "guilty conscience" and may be an indication that Epicurus would have dealt with the myths of the underworld in psychological terms.

Cf. Stork, 117 ff., who deals with Epicurean themes and possible sources.

traditional golden age. It does seem likely then that Epicurus could have rationalized the legends concerning the underworld, although one cannot prove that he did nor can one be certain of the form which such rationalizations would have taken.

The method which Lucretius employs, of course, might be taken as an indication of the general type of explanation which Epicurus would have used. The poet mentions the traditional myth, either first as in the Tantalus and Tityos sections, or mixed with the allegorical interpretations, as in the sections involving Sisyphus and the Danaids, applies the myth to contemporary man, and then adds a section explaining that fear of punishment on earth is responsible for fear of suffering after death. The section comprising 1011-1023, however, seems to be the only section which conforms strictly to the type of explanation which Epicurus would have favored, that is, a section which explicitly and clearly rejects myths concerning the underworld (1011-1013) and then provides a rational explanation for the origin of those myths. Lines 980-1010, on the other hand, do explain away the legends concerning the underworld and stress that these figures do not exist in Acheron, but, rather than explaining away, i.e., rationalizing, the origins of those myths in a specific fashion, Lucretius has employed them as allegorical representations of mortal fears or troubles. In contrast to his method in 1011 ff. the poet's system in 980-1010 does not claim that Tantalus, for example, owes his origin to some superstitious person's imagination, but rather, even though disclaiming its truth, uses the legend of that figure as a negative example to illustrate a point. The distinction between 980-1010 and 1011-1023 possibly is a fine one, but it does exist, and perhaps may become clearer if one realizes that the poet's method in 980 ff. approximates that of the figure *permutatio* carried out *per similitudinem*, which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines as follows (IV 34, 46):

> Permutatio est oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstrans. . . . Per similitudinem sic: 'Quid ait hic rex atque Agamemnon noster, sive, ut crudelitas est, potius Atreus?

Such Lucretian remarks as "Tityos nobis hic est," or "Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis. . ." seem to be related to the figure, albeit the poet intermingles allegory and explanation. Lines 1011-1023, on the contrary, lack the subtlety of 980 ff. and provide a more

obvious and straightforward explanation, conforming to the principles mentioned in the *Letter to Herodotus* and to the explanation found in Democritus.

One cannot state definitely, however, that Lucretius' method in 980-1010 is un-Epicurean, since one does not know precisely what Epicurus would have done, and since Lucretius does rationalize the myths by putting them into human terms, although he does not rationalize them by *specifically* explaining their origin,[107] as he does in 1011 ff. Of course, Epicurus and Epicurean material are not the only possible sources or models for the type of rationalization which Lucretius employs, for, as various scholars have pointed out, the Stoics, the Pythagoreans, and the Academics also employed allegorical interpretations of myths.[108] Further, a famous rationalization of the myth of Medea done by Diogenes of Sinope [109] has been preserved by Stobaeus (*Anthologium*, ed, Hense, 29, 92), and one also should not ignore the work of Euhemerus and the Sophists. In his method of using the explanation of legends for a moralizing purpose, which essentially is what the poet does in 980-1010, Lucretius seems to be closest, however, to the method of Bion and Teles whose moralizing use of Tantalus appears in Teles' Περὶ πενίας (34, 9 ff.). Quoting Homer, and probably relying on a work by Bion (cf. Hense, 34, on lines 9 ff.), the diatribist gives the version of the myth in which the famous malefactor suffers from hunger and thirst, since the pool in which he stands in Hades always dries up whenever he tries to drink and the fruit just above his head always is tossed about out of his reach by the wind. This myth is followed by Teles' interpretation in which the speaker observes

---

[107] One must note here that rationalization can take two forms. The first is the type employed by Diogenes, perhaps also by Epicurus, and by Lucretius in 1011-1023, which explains the origin of a myth. The second is the type employed by Bion-Teles in the use of Tantalus and by Lucretius in 980-1010, which explains a myth in a moralizing fashion, thereby using that myth to illustrate a moral point, employing the method which could be called "allegorical interpretation," although sometimes, as in Bion, the myth acts almost as a simile.

[108] Cf. Konstan, 23 ff; Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 178 ff. (cf. Konstan, 23-24 on Boyancé, 180-181); J. Cousin, "Lucrèce, Les Verseuses et la *Vita Stultorum* (De Nat. Rer., III 1003 sq.)," *Mélanges de Philologie, de Littérature, et d' Histoire Anciennes Offerts à Alfred Ernout* (Paris 1940), 97-106; Ernout and Robin, II, 157. But cf. SVF I, 147 on Zeno (cited by Ernout and Robin, *Ibid.*) and West, 103, on Chrysippus, who ". . . so reconciled the old poetic myths to his own theology that he made out the ancient poets to be Stoics."

[109] Cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 159 and 371; Dudley, *Cynicism*, 33.

that thus the stinginess and despondency of some men fling καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὴν ὀπώραν, not towards the clouds, but towards "ἃ δὲ εἰς τὸ καπηλεῖον, καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντες οὐδενὸς γεύονται." [110]

This description of Tantalus obviously is not the Roman poet's source of information, since Lucretius employs the form of the legend which tells of a stone hanging above the head of the malefactor (cf. Bailey, 1159), while Bion-Teles utilizes the story of the ever-receding food and water. Further, each of Lucretius' explanations (cf. West, 97 ff.) presents some point connected with Epicurean doctrine, although one quickly must add that the evils of superstition, insatiable desire, the search for political power, and ingratitude or dissatisfaction are all themes which had a place within the diatribal tradition. Oltramare, for instance, includes in his general list of topics themes such as "toute *crainte causée par des croyances d'anthromorphisme* doit être écartée" (64, theme 92a), "*le désir est un mal*" (62, theme 78), "*les désirs sont insatiable*" (62, theme 78a), "*les passions asservissent*" (63, theme 84), "*l'amour passionné* est un mal" (63, theme 87), and "le sage ne doit pas s'occuper des *affaires publiques*" (60, theme 71), all of which, of course, apply to different portions of Lucretius' remarks in 980-1010, and which could have been illustrated by rationalized myths in diatribes. A diatribal source (or sources) for 980-1010, then, is not an impossibility (cf. Oltramare, 112), although one probably should assume that here, as elsewhere in the diatribal section of book III, Lucretius has combined a technique used by the diatribe with Epicurean themes which he has adopted from other sources and then has added the section from 1011-1023 which seems likely to be of Epicurean origin.[111]

---

[110] Oltramare, 112, assumes that the "... interprétation des mythes infernaux. . ." in 978-1010 is a diatribal trait; cf. his theme 92b.

[111] Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, 180-181 (cited by Konstan 23-24) mentions parallels between Lucretius' 1023 and Philo Judaeus. Philo, of course, was influenced by the diatribe (cf. Wendland), but one unfortunately cannot build a case for diatribal influence upon Lucretius, 1011-1023, on the basis of this one correspondence. Thus, an Epicurean source for those lines must seem to be the most likely one. Concerning the allegorical section (980-1023) Boyancé comments that a likely source for Lucretius was a mixture of Pythagorean, Platonic, and Stoic themes and observes "et il s'agit, selon moi, de l'Académie contemporaine de Philon et de Virgile, celle qui est revenue au dogmatisme avec Antiochus d'Ascalon." Further, according to Boyancé, Lucretius has adapted or adopted these myths "sans doute parce qu'elle lui a paru rendre raison de la naissance des mythes, expliquer comment les hommes ont pu se laisser égarer par eux." The present writer agrees with

The chief importance of lines 980-1023, as far as the present study is concerned, of course, is not merely the source of those lines, but rather is the fact that they follow the obviously diatribal *prosopopoiiai* and remarks of 931-977 and act as a continuation of the diatribal style, fulfilling the function of the mythological examples or rationalizations commonly found within the Cynic-Stoic genre, as one of many other elements. Further, the rational explanations of Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus, and the Danaids provide brief character sketches describing the behavior of certain types of men in a fashion which must be described as polemical, since these character descriptions obviously are intended as negative examples, illustrating the vices which one should avoid. The use of these character sketches, of mythological examples, of a polemical tone, and of various figures, such as the puns which West (98 ff.) sees in *casum* (983) and *plani* . . . *aequora campi* (1002), the etymological play on *ferat fors* (West, 98; on 983), the anaphora with *nec* (984-985), the chiasmus of *impendens* . . . *saxum, Tantalus* . . . *torpens* (980-981) and of *volucres* . . . *angor* (993), the strong alliteration in lines 990-991 and 995-997, and the homoeoteleuton of *imbibit* and *recedit* (997) and *redeunt* and *ferunt* (1006), are all indicative of the diatribal style, as is the emphasis, produced by *ut famast* (981) and *memorant* (1009), upon the fact that the stories mentioned represent the beliefs of someone other than the author. Thus, even if the poet has used an Epicurean or otherwise non-diatribal source for all of 980-1023, he still has composed a section which fits within the requirements for the genre of diatribe.[112]

After this section concerning legends of punishment after death Lucretius adds an equally diatribal passage dealing with famous men who have died. The poet addresses an imaginary interlocutor and lectures to him as follows (1024-1052):

> Hoc etiam tibi tute interdum dicere possis
> 'lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit

Boyancé concerning everything except the probable source, for although it may, indeed, be Academic, one must allow for the possibility of a diatribal source as well, in view of the poet's previous use of Bion. For possible Pythagorean elements in this section, see Franz Cumont, "Lucrèce et le symbolisme pythagoricien des enfers", *Revue de Philologie* 45 (1920), 229-240, especially 237-240; cf. Boyancé, 180.

[112] Other rhetorical elements in these lines have been noted by Schrijvers, 238-240, who discusses *amplificatio* and hyperbole. One also should note the *epiphoneme* in 1023 (cf. note 3 above).

qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus.
inde alii multi reges rerumque potentes
occiderunt, magnis qui gentibus imperitarunt.
ille quoque ipse, viam qui quondam per mare magnum
stravit iterque dedit legionibus ire per altum
ac pedibus salsas docuit super ire lacunas
et contempsit equis insultans murmura ponti,
lumine adempto animam moribundo corpore fudit.
Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset.
adde repertores doctrinarum atque leporum,
adde Heliconiadum comites; quorum unus Homerus
sceptra potitus eadem aliis sopitu' quietest.
denique Democritum postquam matura vetustas
admonuit memores motus languescere mentis,
sponte sua leto caput obvius obtulit ipse.
ipse Epicurus obit decurso lumine vitae,
qui genus humanum ingenio superavit et omnis
restinxit, stellas exortus ut aetherius sol.
tu vero dubitabis et indignabere obire?
mortua cui vita est prope iam vivo atque videnti,
qui somno partem maiorem conteris aevi
et vigilans stertis nec somnia cernere cessas
sollicitamque geris cassa formidine mentem
nec reperire potes tibi quid sit saepe mali, cum
ebrius urgeris multis miser undique curis
atque animi incerto fluitans errore vagaris.'

The interlocutor is imagined as speaking to himself in these lines (cf. Bailey, 1166) and offering a series of examples (thus using an inductive process) to prove to himself that great men have died before him and therefore he should not "hesitate to die" (Bailey, 1166).

The basic theme upon which the poet constructs the "soliloquy" of his interlocutor is an old one. In Homer, for example, one finds the remark (*Iliad* XXI 105-106; cited by Bailey, 1166),

. . . τί ἦ ὀλοφύρεαι οὕτως;
κάτθανε καὶ Πάτροκλος, ὅ περ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων,

which Achilles makes to Lycaon whom he is about to kill in combat and which bears a thematic resemblance to the Lucretian emphasis upon the deaths of great kings and philosophers who are, of course, "better" than the man whom the Roman poet addresses. A listing of famous dead men in order to illustrate the fact that death cannot be escaped seems to have been a commonplace of consolatory

literature (cf. Stork, 134), being found, for example, in Ps.-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium* (110D; cited by Bailey, 1167), which mentions Croesus and Xerxes. Further, the related theme "death is the common fate of all," appears in the *consolatio* section of *epicedia* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, 150) and in various tomb inscriptions, such as (Lattimore, 252; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 232),

καὶ τὸν ἀνάνκης
κοινὸν Φερσεφόνης πᾶσιν ἔχεις θάλαμον.

Both the Lucretian and Homeric passages differ from the passages found in consolatory literature and inscriptions in that they are not directed at the bereaved, who are presumed to receive some comfort from the knowledge of the fact that the death of their loved one is not unique, but, rather, they are directed either at one whose death literally is imminent, as in the Homeric passage, or at one who is dreading death, as in the Lucretian lines. The effect is still possibly one of consolation, but one cannot ignore the at once angry and straightforward tone of Achilles and the definitely polemical tone of Lucretius, which seems to connect that poet to the diatribe rather than to the *consolatio*.

Certainly the following remarks which the interlocutor allegedly addresses to himself are an attack upon a foolish attitude, despite their consolatory overtones (1045-1050):

> tu vero dubitabis et indignabere obire? / *mortua cui vita est prope iam vivo atque videnti,* / qui *somno* partem maiorem conteris aevi / et vigilans stertis nec *somnia* cernere cessas / sollicitamque geris cassa formidine mentem / nec reperire potes tibi quid sit saepe mali...

We may compare the tone of these lines to the following by Sallust (*Catilinae coniuratio* 2, 8, ed. Kurfess; quoted also by Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 237), which illustrate a similar state of being:

> ... multi mortales, dediti ventri atque *somno*, indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transigere; quibus profecto contra naturam corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit. *eorum ego vitam mortemque iuxta aestumo,* quoniam de utraque siletur.

Both Lucretius and Sallust are criticizing the man who is incapable of doing anything with his life. The goals advocated by each author differ, as do their tones (Lucretius' being the sharper), but perhaps behind both of these accounts is a diatribal theme dealing with dissatisfaction or with the person who is unable to profit from what he possesses (cf. Oltramare, 54, themes 46 and 46a). Lucretius'

connection of the remarks in 1045-1052 and the theme of death as the fate of all, including great men, possibly reflects a diatribal source which dealt with both of these topics, and which, like the remarks of Bion preserved in Teles' Περὶ φυγῆς, offerred a negative sort of consolation by ridiculing the listener's fears and showing him the common nature of the fate which awaited him.[113] Further, one might note that the use of famous men as examples, which, of course, is a common rhetorical device,[114] was a trait of the diatribal style which, for instance, might mention Themistocles' fate as an exile (Teles, Περὶ φυγῆς, 22, 14) or refer to Crates and Diogenes as men who grew old in poverty with no ill effects (Teles, 14, 3 ff.). Thus, a listing of famous men who have died easily could have found a place within a diatribe discussing death or misfortune. Lucretius' list, which has been composed with his Roman audience in mind, might be derived from a list within a diatribe or might owe its conception to consolatory literature. Whatever its origin may have been, however, when it is combined with the polemical remarks of lines 1045-1052, the list ceases to be strictly consolatory and instead becomes a part of the diatribe in book III, serving as a partial basis for the poet's attack upon foolish ideas concerning one's own ultimate fate.

Additional evidence for the diatribal nature of lines 1024-1052 is provided by the various traits, commonly found within the Cynic-Stoic genre, which appear within them. The polemical tone and use of an interlocutor, who, in this case, is depicted as giving himself a lecture, perhaps a standard variation of the diatribal φησί,[115] have already been mentioned. To these one may

---

[113] On the relationship between this passage and the diatribe, see also Bruno Lavagnini, "Motivi Diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale," *Athenaeum* N.S. 25 (1947), 83-88, who discusses 1024 ff. and refers (84) to Oltramare's theme 25d, "la mort est *l'égalisatrice* de toutes les conditions humaines." See also Conte, "Il trionfo. . .," 117-118, on the diatribe and the *consolatio*; cf. Vallette, 534.

[114] Cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 232; Kohl, 17 (Xerxes), 94-96 (Scipio); Stork, 133-134.

[115] This process reminds one of the diatribal themes "il faut s'accuser soi-même" (Oltramare, 55, theme 50b), "il faut faire son *examen de conscience*" (theme 50d), and "il faut *s'adresser des reproches*" (theme 50e). These themes appear later than Lucretius, but they may reflect an earlier tradition which the poet could have followed. The device itself, at any rate, must be rhetorical (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium IV* 52, 65, on such figures as *sermocinatio* and its special variety, the *sermocinatio consequens*).

See Schrijvers, 285-286, on the "monologue;" Conte, "Il trionfo. . .,"

add, first, the use of *improbe* in line 1026, which, even though it is used by the interlocutor to himself, still reflects the same diatribal habit as do the *stulte* of line 939 and the *baratre* of 955, providing a further indication that the tone of the passage is polemical. The rhetorical question in 1045 is another sign of the diatribal style, serving, like the *improbe,* to augment the poet's polemic. One should note also concerning the tone of the passage that the implied antithesis between great men, such as Scipio and Epicurus, and the miserable fool who fears death must give the passage an overall tone of *spoudaiogeloion* in that the listener can be expected to laugh at the presumptuousness of the man who wants to live on and who is the object of his own polemic. *Spoudaiogeloion* and polemic often occur simultaneously or consecutively in diatribes, just as they do here, since polemicism actually can be part of *spoudaiogeloion*. To these diatribal traits must be added the actual quotation of Ennius' remark (*Annales,* fr. 154, Warmington; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III,* 233),

> Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit,

which Lucretius renders as (1025),

> Lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit.

This quotation highlights through contrast the polemical remark (1026),

> qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus,

which follows it. Lines 1034-1035,

> Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
> ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset,

probably are intended as imitations (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, 169 and Kenney, *Lucretius III,* 234) or even as parodies of Ennian lines. Line 1035, in fact, closely resembles fragments 313-314 (Warmington) of the *Annales* (cf. Bailey, 1168), which read:

> . . . Mortalem summum Fortuna repente
> reddidit e summo regno ut famul oltimus esset.

Lucretius' "famul infimus esset" obviously corresponds to Ennius' "famul oltimus esset." The epic tone of this Ennian imitation (1035) and of the probable imitation which precedes it (1034) and

116, on the "continue vivaci mutazioni del discorso", and its relationship to the diatribe, and 128 on the κυνικὸς τρόπος in 1045; Stork, 127.

contains a tricolon crescendo (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 28) composed of epithets for Scipio contrasts strongly with the diatribal polemic found in 1045-1052. One, therefore, is inclined to think that Lucretius has exaggerated the epic style of 1034 in order to point out an ironical antithesis between the great Scipio, to whom so many epithets apply, and the lowly estate of the man who is the victim of the polemic. Further, this exaggeration, which must, therefore, be considered a parody, also contains its own irony, in that even such a famous man now has died and is nothing. Such a parody with its ironic tone is, of course, a device favored by diatribists.[116]

Various rhetorical figures which appear in 1024-1052 further support the contention that these lines owe a debt to the diatribal style. Homoeoteleuton, for example, conforming to the definition of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV 20, 28), appears frequently. In lines 1025-1026, one finds the corresponding verbs *reliquit* and *fuit*, while lines 1027-1028, with *occiderunt* and *imperitarunt*, lines 1030-1033 with *stravit*, *dedit*, *docuit*, *contempsit*, and *fudit*, and lines 1043-1044 with *superavit* and *restinxit* provide additional instances. Homoeoptoton also makes an appearance, being found in the *reges* and *potentes* of line 1027, the *repertores* and the *comites* (and the genitives with them) of 1036-1037, and in the *Epicurus*, *genus*, and *exortus aetherius* of 1042-1044. To these figures must be added the possible wordplay of *cessas* and *cassa* (lines 1048-1049), the anaphora of *adde . . . adde* in 1036-1037 and *nec . . . nec* in 1048-1050, and the isocolon found in the similar length of the phrases *iterque . . . altum*,

---

[116] To these imitations may be added lines 1042-1044 concerning Epicurus, which seem to have been modelled upon the following epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (Gow and Page, 2147-2150; cited by Ernout and Robin, II, 170 and Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 236; Stork, 130):

"Αστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα Σελήνης
ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος Ἠέλιος,
ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος
λαμπρότατον Μουσέων φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.

Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 123, has noted that in lines 1029-1033 Xerxes "non viene mai nominato, ma solo indicato per perifrasi" and that "è la forma proemiale epica quale ci appare nei proemi appunto dell'*Odissea*. . . e dell'*Eneide*." Perhaps Lucretius here also is using the elevated style of an epic *prooemium*, as he uses the imitation of Ennius, with a view to the ironic contrast which he can create between the heroic style and figure and the "wretched" interlocutor.

Concerning epic periphrases and parody in Lucretius, see West, 23 ff., and especially 26-27.

ac . . . *lacunas*, and *et* . . . *ponti* in lines 1030-1032, of the phrases in the tricolon in line 1034, of "tu vero dubitabis" and "indignabere obire" in 1045, and in the parallel lines 1051-1052,

ebrius urgeris multis miser undique curis
atque animi incerto fluitans errore vagaris,

which end with similar syllables.[117] The alliteration of "s's" in 1047-1052, which seems to augment the polemical tone, also is worthy of mention, as is the repeated use of *multus* (as *multis* in 1026 and *multi* in 1027) and *magnus* (as *magnis* in 1028 and *magnum* in 1029), which obviously serves the purpose of emphasis.[118] All of these figures, if considered together, reveal a rhetorical style which, when appearing as it does here in combination with other diatribal traits, must be taken as additional evidence of the poet's continued use of the diatribal style.

The concluding remarks of this section (1046-1052), which deal with the anxiety and discontent of the man, oppressed "multis curis," who, presumably, is not an Epicurean, provide a transition into a section dealing with the restless man and delineating the cause of that restlessness (cf. Bailey, 1170). Lucretius provides the following account (1053-1075), which must be described as a *characterismos* combined with Epicurean doctrine:

Si possent homines, proinde ac sentire videntur
pondus inesse animo quod se gravitate fatiget,
e quibus id fiat causis quoque noscere et unde
tanta mali tamquam moles in pectore constet,
haud ita vitam agerent, ut nunc plerumque videmus
quid sibi quisque velit nescire et quaerere semper
commutare locum quasi onus deponere possit.
exit saepe foras magnis ex aedibus ille,
esse domi quem pertaesumst, subitoque <revertit>,
quippe foris nilo melius qui sentiat esse.
currit agens mannos ad villam praecipitanter,
auxilium tectis quasi ferre ardentibus instans;
oscitat extemplo, tetigit cum limina villae,
aut abit in somnum gravis atque oblivia quaerit,

---

[117] See Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 124, on isocolon and *tetracolon* in the Xerxes section, 125 on alliteration and internal rhyme.

Cf. lines 1046-1052 with their verbs *conteris*, *stertis*, *geris*, *urgeris*, and *vagaris*.

[118] Cf. Conte, 122, who writes of a stylistic "αὔξησις" produced by the use of *multis*, *multi*, and *magnis*, *magnum*. See also Schrijvers, 231. Stork, 131, mentions "die zahlreichen Alliterationen" in 1024 ff.

aut etiam properans urbem petit atque revisit.
hoc se quisque modo fugit, at quem scilicet, ut fit,
effugere haud potis est, ingratis haeret et odit
propterea, morbi quia causam non tenet aeger;
quam bene si videat, iam rebus quisque relictis
naturam primum studeat cognoscere rerum,
temporis aeterni quoniam, non unius horae,
ambigitur status, in quo sit mortalibus omnis
aetas, post mortem quae restat cumque, manenda.

In depicting the foolish activities of the restless man (1060-1070) Lucretius, as Heinze notes (*Lucretius III*, 198), is following the method of instruction involving "τὰ παρακολουθοῦν[τ]α κακὰ τιθέναι πρὸ ὀμμάτων", which Philodemus recommends in the *De ira* (I, 21-23; ed. Wilke). In order to present the κακά connected with restlessness, however, the poet has drawn upon the genre developed by Theophrastus, and used by Ariston of Ceos, and, indirectly, by Philodemus in the tenth book of his Περὶ κακιῶν. Lucretius' character sketch, in fact, resembles the style employed by Theophrastus for his *Characteres* in that the description is based upon the activities of the man involved, which are described in rather short and simple sentences (cf., for example, Theophrastus' ἀηδής and ὀψιμαθής), thus creating a picture which is vivid and easily understood. None of the surviving sketches by the Peripatetic philosopher deals with the type which the Roman poet describes, but such a person could have been depicted in sketches now lost or in the work of later Peripatetics such as Ariston of Ceos (cf. Wallach, Dissertation, 111-116), who delineates some characters which do not appear in the extant sketches of Theophrastus. One must assume that Lucretius could have known the work of Theophrastus or of other Peripatetics who wrote *Characterismoi*, but the poet's knowledge of the character sketch did not have to depend upon these sources. A common rhetorical device with which Lucretius must have been familiar was *notatio* or character description, defined as "cum alicuius natura certis describitur signis, quae, sicuti notae quae, naturae sunt adtributa" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 50, 63). From the example provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*Ibid.*), it is obvious that *notatio* and the Peripatetic *characterismos* are the same device, although the model given by the rhetorical handbook seems to include more dialogue than the typical character sketch by Theophrastus does. Lucretius, then, could have known and used the figure *notatio* as a result of his rhetorical education

and may or may not have used Peripatetic character sketches as a source of inspiration. The sketch which appears in 1060-1070, at any rate, describes a common Roman situation (cf. Bailey, 1170) involving "a well-to-do Roman, with a large town house and a country estate—a man such as Memmius and many of L.'s other (hoped-for) readers" (Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 239), and therefore, even if it was inspired by a Greek model, it has been given a totally Roman application by the poet (cf. Murley, 385).[119]

The basic message of the character sketch is, of course, Epicurean. Lucretius wants to instruct his readers in the problems which beset the restless man who fears death, actually without realizing it, because he has not attained that state of calm (ἀταραξία) which comes with the study and understanding of Epicurean doctrine concerning the nature of everything, including death (cf. Kenney, 238; Bailey, 1170: Epicurus *K* Δ XI and XII, and *Letter to Menoeceus* 122). The point of the section obviously is that the Epicurean philosophy provides the solution for the difficulties which the poet depicts.[120] In presenting this message Lucretius continues to use the diatribal style, once again mingling Epicurean doctrine with it and perhaps also with one of its themes concerning "μεμψιμοιρία" (cf. Kenney, 238) or dissatisfaction with one's lot in life (cf. Teles, 43, 1 ff.). One indication of the diatribal nature of this passage is, of course, the *characterismos* which it contains, since such brief sketches were commonplace within the genre. Further, the nervous activities of the character described must be considered a source of *spoudaiogeloion*, for one must smile at the ridiculous appearance

[119] Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 239, notes that lines 1058 ff., ". . . are reminiscent of the Soldier's Chorus in Ennius' *Iphigenia*, Sc. 234-41, V. 2 (195-202 Jocelyn)," and adds "that soldiers in a tragedy should moralize in this way shows the power of the semi-philosophical commonplace (already well established in Euripides)." We should add that 1058 ff. also show the prevailing influence of the character sketch.

This section may reflect the diatribal topic "*les désirs sont insatiables.*' (Oltramare, 62, theme 78a), which is based on Teles, 43, 1 ff. See footnote 126 below.

For a somewhat similar tone and mood, cf. Crates on unhappiness and the busy pace of life, in Teles, 49, 1-51; Dudley, *Cynicism*, 45, translates this passage. See also *Axiochus*, 366D ff. and Stork, 150, on the *Axiochus* passage.

[120] Kenney, 241, writes concerning 1073, "unius horae," that "L.'s implication is apparently that if we fix our attention on the great questions of philosophy, which include death and the eternal extinction of body and soul, we shall achieve ἀταραξία and boredom will disappear."

Cf. Agnes K. Michels, "Death and Two Poets," *TAPA* 86 (1955), 167.

made by the restless man at the same time as one seriously views his problem and its causes (cf. Fiske, 186, on *spoudaiogeloion* in character sketches). To these diatribal traits must be added the homiletic or moralizing tone which the poet has adopted in this passage, and which contrasts with the biting polemic of the section preceding it. Lucretius still is holding folly up to ridicule, but his manner is more didactic and chiding than hostile (cf. Teles, 8, 6 ff. for a similar tone following a polemical section).

Several figures which occur in lines 1053-1075 offer further proof of the diatribal nature of the passage, since they indicate the rhetorical style in which it is written, a style which, of course, is characteristic of the diatribe. Chief among these figures is homoeoteleuton, which, once again, is used almost excessively. Thus in lines 1060-1061, one finds the verbs *exit* and *revertit*, which are chiastically arranged, while 1065-1068 contain *tetigit*, *abit*, *quaerit*, *petit*, *revisit*, *fugit*, and *fit*, which provide homoeoteleuton (cf. Deutsch, 69) conforming to the definition in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. The effect produced by all of these similar endings is an emphasis upon the constant activity of the restless man. A second important figure involving verbs is *coniunctio*, which appears in line 1055, where the infinitive *noscere* provides the connection for the clauses beginning with *e quibus* and *unde*.

Equally noteworthy is the frequent alliteration which often seems to contribute to the restless mood being depicted. The repeated use of "t" sounds, for example, helps to emphasize the verbs and to remind the reader of the constant movement of the character involved in the sketch. Further, the combination of t's, m's, and s's in 1056 impresses upon the listener the weight of the burden felt by one who is restless.[121] To the figures already mentioned may be added the obvious asyndeton between the phrases "oscitat extemplo" and "tetigit cum limina villae" (1065), and between "temporis aeterni quoniam" and "non unius horae" (1073), which, in this second example, stresses the idea of eternity in contrast to the brief time in which a man is alive. Also worthy of mention is the use of the simile (1064)

auxilium tectis quasi ferre ardentibus instans,

which, since it refers to a commonplace scene, easily is understood

---

[121] On this and other alliterations, cf. Stork, 139-140, and 141 ff., on sentence-structure; Deutsch, 17.

and is compatible with the diatribal style. One should note additionally the chiasmus found in this simile and the line which precedes it, formed by the correspondence of *agens* and *instans*. All of these figures, when taken in conjunction with the basically straightforward style of the passage, with its homiletic tone, character sketch, and *spoudaiogeloion*, offer clear evidence that lines 1053-1075 have been written in a diatribal style and fit well with the diatribal sections which precede them.

After this passage concerning restlessness and its cure the poet concludes his diatribe with a section which repeats some of the topics with which he has dealt in lines 830-1075. Lucretius first asks his listener (1076-1077),

> Denique tanto opere in dubiis trepidare periclis
> quae mala nos subigit vitai tanta cupido?,

thereby mentioning the eagerness for life which he has criticized in his two *prosopopoiiai* and the remarks following them (931-971) and in his section ridiculing the man who wanted to keep his life even though so many great men had been unable to retain theirs (1024-1052). The rhetorical question with its emphasis upon the "evil craving for life" (Bailey, 357) establishes the moralizing tone of the remarks which follow it, when the poet states, (1078-1079)

> certa quidem finis vitae mortalibus adstat
> nec devitari letum pote quin obeamus,

and adds,

> praeterea versamur ibidem atque insumus usque
> nec nova vivendo procuditur ulla voluptas,

taking the listener back, again, to the points expressed by *Natura* and by the author commenting upon *Natura*'s speech (931-971). In his next three lines (1082-1084),

> sed dum *abest quod avemus*, id exsuperare videtur
> cetera; post aliud, cum contigit illud, avemus
> et sitis aequa tenet vitai semper hiantis,

Lucretius reiterates the point which *Natura* made in 957-958, when she scolded the complaining old man and said,

> sed quia semper *aves quod abest*, praesentia temnis,
> imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita.

Lines 1085-1086,

posteraque in dubiost fortunam quam vehat aetas,
quidve ferat nobis casus quive exitus instet,

also must be taken as a partial reminiscence of lines 957-958 and of 959-960,

et nec opinanti mors ad caput adstitit. . .,

in the sense that the exact time of death is one of the things which cannot be anticipated. These lines are followed then by 1087 ff.,

nec prorsum vitam ducendo demimus hilum
tempore de mortis nec delibare valemus,
quo minus esse diu possimus forte perempti.
proinde licet quot vis vivendo condere saecla;
mors aeterna tamen nilo minus illa manebit,
nec minus ille diu iam non erit, ex hodierno
lumine qui finem vitai fecit, et ille,
mensibus atque annis qui multis occidit ante,

which remind one of the poet's emphasis in 832-869 and in 971-975 upon the total destruction of consciousness which comes with death and of his use of analogies to one's unconsciousness before birth. Lines 1087-1094, of course, are dealing with the concept that death is inevitable and eternal, and that the length of time during which one is dead is not lessened by the living of an extremely long life. The emphasis upon eternity and upon the comparison of present and future time, however, resembles the method which Lucretius employed in the other sections mentioned and also seems to be intended to remind one of the poet's remarks in 1071-1075 concerning the difference between the "eternity" of death and the comparatively brief time of one's life.[122]

This discussion concerning the themes reiterated with variations in lines 1076-1094 has been intended to show that these lines do fit in well with the diatribal sections which precede them and that they can be taken as a proper conclusion for the entire diatribe,[123] providing the equivalent of the *enumeratio* of the concluding section

[122] See Stork, 145-149, who also notes the connections between 1076-1094 and sections of 830-1075. Cf. 132-133 for connections between 1024-1052 and lines in earlier sections.

[123] Cf. Bailey, 1173, who sees this passage as "a series of disconnected points," and comments that it "is unsatisfactory as a conclusion."
See Conte, "Il trionfo. . .", 118 ff. on the "patetica *peroratio* dei vv. 1053sgg.".

of a speech, just as lines 830 ff. partially served as an *enumeratio* concluding the discussion which preceded them. One need not press too hard the connection of these lines with what precedes them, however, since rather loose connections between points or paragraphs is characteristic of the diatribal style and may apply also to the conclusion of a diatribe, although one cannot be certain, of course, that the conclusions of the preserved sections of diatribes of Teles actually formed the conclusions of entire diatribes. Lucretius does make a very important point at the end of book III, a point which stresses the foolishness of trying to extend one's lifetime as long as possible and which, as was shown above, is connected loosely with 832 ff. and more closely with 1071 ff., as well as with the poet's theme in lines 1024-1052. Further, the use of this type of important and pointed statement reminds one of the conclusion of Teles' Περὶ ἀπαθείας (if it indeed is the conclusion) which ends with remarks concerning the good man's ability to withstand fortune (cf. Oltramare, 57, theme 57a). These remarks are, of course, related to the author's attempt to depict an ideal state of "ἀπάθεια", but they do not contain any *specific* references to the earlier sections of the diatribe in which Teles dealt with the necessity of ridding oneself of emotions. The fact that the good man is the one who has attained that state known as ἀπάθεια, discussed in the beginning of the diatribe, and therefore also has attained self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια), provides the link between the beginning and the conclusion of the lecture. Lucretius may have followed a similar method, although one cannot prove that such a procedure was indeed a common diatribal one, and one cannot help but notice that the poet's conclusion bears a closer relationship to specific themes discussed in his diatribe than does the conclusion of Teles' work. At any rate, one cannot dismiss lines 1076-1094 easily as an insufficient conclusion, but rather one must allow for the possibility that they represent a diatribal method or that they are intended to leave the audience with certain important points which the poet wishes to stress.[124]

[124] Additionally, one may comment, as Kenney does (*Lucretius III*, 242), that "perhaps it suffices to say that it seems as good a way to end the book as any; only Book I, as Heinze remarks, is rounded off with anything like a formal epilogue." Kenney also writes that "some of the arguments we have admittedly met before, but some are new." Possibly, abrupt endings should be considered the norm in Lucretius, and perhaps one should allow for some influence from the Greek archaic style, on which see B. A. van

Before concluding the discussion of these lines we should remark that their style follows the diatribal tradition evident in 830-1075. The rhetorical questions with which they begin, the short sentences, and the use of observations such as (1078-1079),

> certa quidem finis vitae mortalibus adstat
> nec devitari letum pote quin obeamus,

and (1085-1086)

> posteraque in dubiost fortunam quam vehat aetas,
> quidve ferat nobis casus quive exitus instet,

which have a proverbial sound (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, 243; Otto, 369), all place them within the tradition of the Cynic-Stoic genre.[125] Further, the *spoudaiogeloion* which is evident in the image of "... sitis ... vitai semper hiantis," reminding one of Bion's utterances (Teles, 39, 1 ff.) on the need to avoid giving χρήματα to the greedy (illustrated by a simile based upon a man with dropsy) [126] and the facetiousness of the poet's final remarks concerning the impossibility of being dead for a "shorter" time are equally indicative of possible diatribal influence. One also may see in the sarcastic concluding statements some trace of an imaginary opponent, since Lucretius is holding up to ridicule an exaggerated version of an opinion which someone could hold unconsciously. By showing

---

Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque, Procédés et réalisations* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.S. 65, 2; Amsterdam 1958), *passim.*

See also Stork, 147 ff.

[125] Stork, 149-150, shows the connection between these two themes and consolatory literature, noting that 1078-1079 reflect the *topos* "Alle Menschen müssen sterben" (149; based on Esteve-Forriol, 150) and that 1085-1086 reflect the theme rendered by Esteve-Forriol (152, 70; Stork, 150) as "Der Tote ist den Leiden und der Unsicherheit des Leben entronnen."

Certainly neither of these topics would be out of place in a diatribe concerning death or burial, and the second *topos* is very general and capable of being used in a discussion of various subjects.

[126] To this diatribal example may be added those themes mentioned above in connection with line 957, which line 1082 resembles, and Oltramare's theme 78a (62) "*les désirs sont insatiables.*" Oltramare's illustration for the theme is Teles, 43, 1 ff., which tells of the ever-increasing desires of the man who is never satisfied with what he has, just as the character in Lucretius' illustration is never satisfied.

Stork, 151, mentions the Epicurean themes in 1076-1094, citing Epicurus' *Letter to Menoeceus* in Usener, 60, 17-20; 61, 12 ff.; 61, 19 ff.; and, especially, 62, 4-7.

A mixture of Epicurean themes with commonplace topics of the diatribe or of the consolatory tradition in general seems likely.

that even if one lives for *saecla*, the extent of time for which one is dead cannot be shortened, the poet has reduced to absurdity the desire of his opponent (i.e., of "common opinion") to prolong his life for even a short period. Since such a *reductio ad absurdum*[127] is a common method used by the diatribe and by Lucretius in dealing with the views of an imaginary opponent or interlocutor, one may assume that in these lines the poet also has his vague "adversary" in mind.

Among the diatribal traits mentioned also should be reckoned the homoeoteleuton which Lucretius uses so often in his poetic diatribe. Lines 1091-1094, for example, contain the poet's normal use of the figure with verbs having similar endings, as one can see in the resemblances evident in *manebit, erit, fecit,* and *occidit.* One may also cite 1085-1086 in which appear the verbs *vehat* and *ferat,* an instance of homoeoteleuton[128] combined with the homoeoptoton of *casus* and *exitus* and three isocola, *fortunam ... aetas, quidve ... casus, quive ... instet* (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV 20, 28).

[127] These lines (1090-1094) remind one of the exchange in Teles' Περὶ ἀπαθείας (61, 2 ff.), which also seems to be a *reductio ad absurdum.* In a section concerned with death and one's attitude toward it, one speaker observes that a friend who has died "οὐκέτι ἔσται." For the second speaker's reply, see above at footnote 10.

See also Teles, 42, 10-43, 7, for another example of the diatribist's practice of revealing the absurdity in certain views or behavior.

[128] By the stricter definition of Quintilian, homoeoteleuton must be confined to the "similem duarum sententiarum vel plurium finem" (IX 3, 77), while homoeoptoton is "tantum casu simile, etiam si dissimilia sint quae declinentur, nec tantum in fine deprehenditur, set respondentibus vel primis inter se vel mediis vel extremis vel etiam permutatis his" (IX 3, 78). Cf. Lausberg, I, 361, 725 ff. The definitions given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* seem to be more flexible, although all of the examples of homoeoteleuton involve similar clause endings and are restricted to words that do not decline (IV 20, 28). An example such as "vivis invidiose, delinquis studiose, loqueris odiose," in which the homoeoteleuton of the adverbs is at the end of the phrases, but which also includes verbs with similar endings although not at the end of phrases, would seem to indicate that some leeway should be allowed in the interpretation of the figure. Thus, when Lucretius uses a series of verbs with similar terminations, apparently to achieve a special effect, one may class such a usage as homoeoteleuton, resembling homoeoptoton but employing verbs, even if no phrase or clause ending is involved.

Cf. Bailey, 154-155, for a looser usage of the term homoeoteleuton.

See also Leeman, I, 34-35, who, in discussing the *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* observes that homoeoptoton "occurs when two or more words appear in the same case and with the same terminations," and that homoeoteleuton "is the rhyming of words by other effects." Our usage of the terms in this study basically is in conformity with Leeman's view.

Isocolon again is evident, along with a type of parallel structure, in 1091-1094. Here the phrases *mors . . . manebit, ex . . . fecit,* and *et . . . ante* have a similar, but not identical, number of syllables, while the phrase *nec . . . erit* gives the illusion of being equal to *mors . . . manebit* because of the parallel use of *nilo minus* and *nec minus.*[129] Line 1091 is additionally noteworthy because of the oxymoron of *mors aeterna,* which not only harks back to the *mors immortalis* of 869 (cf. Stork, 153), but also is an ironic contrast to the interlocutor's implied desire for a longer life which amounts to a *vita aeterna.* This contrast is further heightened by the *amplificatio* of 1092-1094, when the poet expands the notion of time in death and, as Schrijvers has observed (283), "la grandeur du vainqueur (l'éternité) dérive de la grandeur du vaincu (le temps)," thus providing an "exemple d'amplification indirecte."

With these lines the diatribe in Lucretius' third book ends.[130] From our analysis of 830-1094 it must be evident that this section, despite its use of consolatory topics, is not a *consolatio* attempting only to comfort the still-living man who must die someday (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III,* 32 on the definition of a *consolatio*), but rather is a diatribe in poetic form which attempts to destroy through ridicule those wrong attitudes and opinions which produce the fear of death and make a man miserable. Lucretius' diatribe is consolatory in the same sense that a Bionean diatribe on death, exile, or "ἀπάθεια" (especially in the face of grief for oneself or for others) is consolatory, in that it employs certain themes commonly found in the *consolatio,* the *epicedion,* and in tomb inscriptions and then uses those topics to point out the folly of certain attitudes. Both Bion and Lucretius, for example, indicate the foolishness of concern for one's burial, thereby taking the common topics of burial rites and death in a foreign land or in the sea and employing them as a means of destroying a common opinion through ridicule. The removal of concern for one's corpse may have a consolatory effect, of course, but the polemic and sarcastic tone employed by both writers in making their point must be considered foreign to the *consolatio* as a genre. Thus, one should not assume that the presence of *consolatory* topics within Lucretius III 830-1094

---

[129] See Stork, 153, who mentions the "Gegenüberstellung von ille . . . ille" and the "Parallelität des Anfangs der Verse 1089 und 1092."

[130] For a discussion of the "Kampf gegen die Todesfurcht" elsewhere in Lucretius, see Regenbogen, 347 ff.

implies that the poet has written a poetic *consolatio*, for one has ample precedents within the diatribal tradition (cf. Teles' Περὶ φυγῆς and Περὶ ἀπαθείας) for the use of such topics as parts of a diatribe.

Further, one must note that the form of 830-1094 is that of a typical diatribe, another factor which removes the passage from the realm of the *consolatio*. The poet announces his topic in 830 and proceeds to "prove" it through a rhetorical argument employing analogy (in an Epicurean fashion). The appearance of a well-known proverb, of an ironic tone, and of an epic parody in this first section (830-869) are strong indications of the use of a diatribal style. In his next section (870-893), as was noted in the discussion earlier in this chapter, the poet employs topics and a form of enumeration found within the fragments of Bion, and in expressing a mixture of diatribal topics and Epicurean doctrine, utilizes an imaginary opponent, two parodies, a character sketch, and certain rhetorical figures, all written in a tone which combines *spoudaiogeloion* and polemicism. This tone continues into 894-911, where the poet assigns dialogue to his "opponent" and then reduces to absurdity the commonplace and sentimental remarks made by that interlocutor. The possibility that these lines are a parody of topics and scenes commonly found in consolatory literature or in epigrams dealing with death is in keeping with the diatribe's fondness for parody and with Bion's tendency to ridicule such common topics (cf. Teles, 30-31). After this section of dialogue and response Lucretius inserts a banqueting scene which allows him to attack the idea that there is sensation after death and to illustrate his point through an analogy. The use of a scene drawn from familiar experiences, of course, is a device frequently occurring within the Cynic-Stoic genre, and when combined, as it is here, with an interlocutor and a sarcastic tone, must connect the author to the diatribal tradition.

The next long section contains the two *prosopopoiiai* which were discussed at length above and which reflect the diatribe in their style, tone, rhetorical devices, and themes, especially in the first *prosopopoiia*, but also in the second, where lines 961-962 seem quite close to preserved remarks by Bion. In his statements which follow these *prosopopoiiai* the poet also seems to have imitated Bion, for, as was shown above, lines 971 and 972-973 reflect two Bionean comments. After his *prosopopoiiai* and remarks following

them Lucretius inserts a section (978-1023) which rationalizes legends concerning the punishment of famous malefactors in the underworld and then claims that the origin of fears concerning punishment after death is the guilty conscience of those who have committed evils while they are alive. Kenney (*Lucretius III*, 222) has observed concerning this passage that "L.'s explanations are relevant in general terms to his declared intention of enlightening mankind and freeing them from superstition (3.14-27), but seem somewhat out of place in the context of a *consolatio*." No such problem exists, however, if one assumes that Lucretius has written a diatribe rather than a *consolatio*, for such rationalizations or moralizations employing mythology were common within the Cynic-Stoic genre. Although one cannot prove that Bion or his imitators ever rationalized these particular myths, the technique is diatribal and must have been applied by Lucretius to myths which suited his purposes. The use of an enumeration of famous dead men, accompanied by the appearance of an interlocutor who is made to ridicule himself, the inclusion of a section dealing with dissatisfaction and the value of philosophy, illustrated by a character sketch, and of a concluding passage which provides a succinct summary of previously-made points and ends with a thought which is both a *reductio ad absurdum* and a memorable remark complete the diatribe of book III and provide additional elements of the medley of devices which comprise it. All of the traits and devices which have been listed here are characteristics of the diatribal style, especially when they are used together with rather loose connections, as they are in this case.[131] Some of these traits also occur within *consolationes* (cf. Ps.-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium*), but the significant factor within 830-1094, which must be stressed again here, is the tone that Lucretius adopts, which often includes *spoudaiogeloion* and which never loses its sarcastic nature, even when its polemicism is softened by humor or by a tone which

[131] One must emphasize in this discussion of Lucretius and the diatribe that the appearance elsewhere in the poem of traits such as alliteration and other figures common in the diatribal style or parody or rhetorical arguments does not alter the designation of III 830-1094 as a passage written in the diatribal style or weaken the arguments for the existence of such a style. The "diatribal style" is an aggregate of those traits mentioned above in chapter I, and most of its characteristics do appear *individually* in other genres or styles. The use of those traits in combination, when joined to the employment of an imaginary interlocutor and of a tone of spoudaiogeloion, gives the diatribe its distinct generic form.

is more didactic or homiletic than polemic. This tone removes the poet's lecture concerning death from the realm of the *consolatio* and places it firmly within the tradition of the diatribes of Bion and Teles, which employed a similar tone even when dealing with consolatory topics. One does not console by reducing one's listener to ridicule, but one can attempt, as the diatribe does, to remove the source of difficulty through a combination of facetious humor and philosophical commonplaces.

CHAPTER THREE

EPILOGUE

Theories concerning the proper function and subject matter of poetry and the relationship between rhetoric and poetry have exercised critics for centuries. Aristotle, for example, after mentioning those people who classify men as poets "οὐχ ὡς κατὰ τὴν μίμησιν ποιητὰς ἀλλὰ κοινῇ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον προσαγορεύοντες," notes that if someone brings out something "ἰατρικὸν ἢ φυσικόν" written in meter, he commonly is called a poet. Taking Empedocles as his example of one who has written something scientific in meter Aristotle continues his remarks with the observation that "Homer and Empedocles, however, have really nothing in common apart from their metre; so that, if one is to be called a poet, the other should be termed a physicist rather than a poet." [1] Aristotle's views, as J. F. D'Alton has remarked, are "founded on aesthetic reasons," although "ethical considerations" are not totally absent. Among later critics, such as Eratosthenes, who argued that "the end of Poetry was to charm and not to teach," and the Stoics, who saw moral teaching as "the poet's chief aim," [2] a battle of morality vs. aesthetics developed. This conflict is reflected in the Περὶ ποιημάτων of Philodemus, who reports the opinions of others and himself "explicitly denies any didactic or moral purpose to poetry. . .".[3] Cicero, a contemporary of Philode-

---

[1] Aristotle Περὶ ποιητικῆς 1447b14 ff.; cf. W. S. Howell, "Rhetoric and Poetics: A Plea for the Recognition of the Two Literatures," *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. Luitpold Wallach (Ithaca 1966), 378. I am quoting from the translation by Ingram Bywater (reprinted New York 1954, Modern Library), 224. The Greek text is from the edition by R. Kassel (Oxford 1965).

[2] D'Alton, 485; cf. G. M. A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (London 1965), 128 and 195 ff. My discussion partly follows D'Alton's arrangement. See also the chapters entitled "The End of Fine Art," and "Art and Morality," in S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, with a Critical Text and Translation of the Poetics* (New York 1951; rep. of the 1911 ed.), 198-239.

Concerning the Stoics, see P. H. DeLacy, "Stoic Views of Poetry," *American Journal of Philology* 69 (1948), 241-271.

[3] Grube, 197; D. M. Schenkeveld, "OI KPITIKOI in Philodemus," *Mnemosyne* 21 (1968), 176-214; L. P. Wilkinson, "Philodemus and Poetry," *Greece and Rome* 2 (1933), 144-151; Christian Jensen (ed.), *Philodemus*

mus, seems to have held varying opinions concerning poetry, although his translation of Aratus and his esteem for Empedocles (*De oratore* I, 217), when combined with his rhetorical praise of poetry in the *Pro Archia*, would seem to place him among those Romans who, like Horace, argued that poetry involved both pleasure and instruction, and possessed some usefulness.[4]

The compromise between the concepts of poetry as moral teaching and as pleasure was not always a balanced one, since some critics accepted both aspects to a certain degree but still stressed one more than the other. Quintilian, for example, does state that young boys must be taught "non modo quae diserta, sed vel magis quae honesta sunt . . ." (I 8, 4), and he recommends Homer, Vergil, the tragedians, and lyric poetry (censored as necessary) as proper reading material for them.[5] In his famous discussion of Greek and Roman literature, however, although he admits that there may be some ethical "responsibility" attached to poetry, Quintilian also comments, "meminerimus tamen, non per omnia poetas esse oratori sequendos nec libertate verborum nec licentia figurarum: genus ostentationi comparatum et praeter id, quod solam petit voluptatem eamque etiam fingendo non falsa modo, sed etiam quaedam incredibilia sectatur. . ." (X 1, 28).[6] Such a view does not prevent the Roman rhetorician from according an educational value to metrical works, but this value is connected with

über die Gedichte, fünftes Buch, griechischer Text mit Übersetzungen und Erläuterungen (Zürich rep. 1973); Severin Koster, *Antike Epostheorien* (Palingenesia 5; Wiesbaden 1970), 93-99 and 143 ff.

[4] On Cicero, Horace, and the Roman "compromise between Profit and Pleasure as the end of Poetry," see D'Alton, 145-148 and 486-488. Cf. Horace *Epistles* II 1, 124 ff. and D'Alton, 488, on the usefulness of the poet; C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry, I, Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (Cambridge 1963), 177 and 221 ff., and *II, The "Ars Poetica"* (Cambridge 1971), 352 ff.

[5] Regarding Quintilian and the school authors, see Gwynn, 198-199. Quintilian also mentions the possible use of prose writers (II 5, 1) and refers to the value of comedy, especially Menander, for stylistic studies (I 8, 7 ff.). See also D'Alton, 486, for the rhetorician's interest in style rather than in ethics.

[6] Cf. D'Alton, 486-487, who cites the following remark as evidence that Quintilian did not "relieve" the poet "of all moral responsibility" (X i, 100):

> Togatis excellit Afranius: utinam non inquinasset argumenta puerorum foedis amoribus mores suos fassus.

See also Grube, 301, who writes that "Quintilian obviously shared Horace's belief that poetry should instruct as well as delight, and Horace's preference for a moral tale rather than melodious trifles. . .". But see above after footnote 6 ff.

the continuing study of style, pursued by the student "cum eo... perductus est, ut intelligere ea sine demonstrante et sequi iam suis viribus possit..." (X 1, 15),[7] and is not concerned with ethical instruction. In other words, for Quintilian, the poetry used to instruct the younger student must be carefully chosen by the instructor and must be devoid of material which would have an adverse effect upon the moral development of the pupil. The rhetorician does not claim, however, that all poetry must have a moral purpose or be useful for teaching morals, and, as was noted above, he states that poetry "... solam petit voluptatem." Further, once a student has reached an age at which he no longer is able to be "corrupted" or unduly influenced by the content of his reading matter, he no longer needs to be restricted in his reading of poetry to works that are "morally uplifting" but should read authors whose works have stylistic merit and can aid in the continuing development of the orator (cf. Steinmetz in footnote 7). Reflecting an opinion partly reminiscent of Quintilian's in its concern with the place of poetry in education, the Greek Plutarch admits the enjoyment inherent in poetry, but his primary interest is in the use of poetry for teaching philosophy (*Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 15F-16A). In connection with his advice concerning the introduction of the "adolescens" to poetry, however, the moralist warns that the youth should be aware of "τὸ 'πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἀοιδοὶ' τὰ μὲν ἑκόντες τὰ δ' ἄκοντες" (cf. Quintilian as quoted above). Plutarch also claims that one knows of no "ἄμυθον οὐδ' ἀψευδῆ ποίησιν", and he excludes the works of Empedocles, Parmenides, Nicander, and the gnomes of Theognis from the realm of true poetry, observing that they have taken over "παρὰ ποιητικῆς ὥσπερ ὄχημα τὸ μέτρον καὶ τὸν ὄγκον, ἵνα τὸ πεζὸν διαφύγωσιν." [8]

---

[7] Cf. D'Alton, 445 and 464 ff.; Peter Steinmetz, "Gattungen und Epochen der griechischen Literatur in der Sicht Quintilians," *Hermes* 92 (1964), 455.

On the traditional and the original elements in Quintilian's list of authors, cf. Grube, 299 ff., and Steinmetz, 454-466.

[8] Plutarch, 16A-C. The collection of texts in *Ancient Literary Criticism, The Principal Texts in New Translations*, ed. D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom (Oxford 1972), is useful for texts on specific literary topics.

Plutarch's *Quomodo adolescens...* is cited after the Teubner edition by W. Nachstädt (1935, rep. 1971).

For Plutarch's views concerning poetry as "a means of ethical education", see Charles Sears Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, Interpreted from Representative Works* (New York 1924), 239-242. One should note that

Those critics who stressed pleasure as the aim of poetry or warned of its "fiction" might be expected to discount the poetic worth of the didactic genres, as Plutarch does, but such may not always have been the case. For example, the Alexandrian poets, from whose ranks Eratosthenes sprang, and whose learned poetry was concerned with entertainment and did not support "... the classical concept of the poets as the teachers of their people...," [9] admired Hesiod and often produced didactic poems. Further, Quintilian, whose opinions were noted above, at least did not despise didactic verse, for he cites Hesiod as an example of the middle style (X 1, 52), and writes "... Macer et Lucretius legendi quidem, sed non ut phrasin, id est, corpus eloquentiae faciant, elegantes in sua quisque materia sed alter humilis, alter difficilis" (X 1, 87). Varro Atacinus also is mentioned by the rhetorician and described as the "interpres operis alieni, non spernendus quidem, verum ad augendam facultatem dicendi parum locuples." (X 1, 87). Quintilian, of course, is concerned primarily with the style of these poets and with their use in a rhetorical education, and, therefore his acceptance of didactic poetry cannot be seen as a contradiction of his opinion concerning the purpose of poetry, especially since even didactic poems can give pleasure through their style. One might add here that Aristotle in the *Ars Rhetorica* (1369b 33-1372a3) discusses the nature of pleasure and observes in 1371b 4 ff. that, since τὸ μανθάνειν and τὸ θαυμάζειν are pleasant, then τὸ μιμούμενον, such as γραφική, ἀνδριαντοποιία, and ποιητική, also must be pleasant. The philosopher, further, stresses the pleasure contributed by learning from a "product of skilful imitation." [10] Since Aristotle considered learning a source of pleasure, one may

---

Plutarch warns of the dangers of an uncritical approach to poetry and stresses the need for guidance of the young, a view not quite identical to that held by critics who saw the whole purpose of a poem, from its inception, as ethical instruction, devoid of pleasure.

On poetry and philosophy, see also F. M. Cornford, "The Quarrel of Philosophy and Poetry," *Principium Sapientiae, The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought*, ed. W. K. C. Guthrie (New York rep. ed. 1965), 143-155.

[9] Grube, 126. Concerning Alexandrian didactic poetry, cf. A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, tr. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer (London 1966), 750 ff.; Franz Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (Leipzig 1891), *passim* in both volumes.

[10] The phrase is from the translation by W. Rhys Roberts, who compares the passage (71) to *Poetics* 1448b5-19. Russell and Winterbottom, 134, classify this passage as "The Origins of Aesthetic Pleasure."

assume that despite his dismissal of Empedocles as a poet the philosopher might have admitted that some pleasure could be derived from the information supplied in a didactic poem, although a lack of "μίμησις" in the work might have led to his refusal to classify it as poetry. So also those critics who considered aesthetic pleasure the sole or major end of poetry, and especially the learned Alexandrians, might have seen didactic poetry as pleasant because of the learning that it conveyed, as well as because of the form or style in which it was written.[11] This possibility cannot be proved, of course, and is suggested only as a view which could have been held by some proponents of didactic verse without compromising a conception of poetry as pleasure.

The problem of the aim of poetry is connected intimately with the question of the relationship between poetry and rhetoric, for, if poetry aims only to please, then, for some critics, the introduction of persuasion or persuasive devices into a poem must be a violation of the purity of the genre, smacking of an attempt to force verse to deliver a moral message or to serve a utilitarian purpose (cf. footnote 12 below). In fact, the total separation of rhetoric and poetics frequently has been advocated by modern critics and scholars who correctly note that the ancients recognized a distinction between the two.[12] Recognizing a distinction and strictly maintaining it in practice, however, are two different things. As Hoyt H. Hudson has stated (379), there is a ". . .distinction between pure poetry and rhetoric" but ". . . rarely do we find them pure." Such a *dictum* is especially true of Greek and Roman literature as a result of the common rhetorical training of the educated classes. Since both poetry and prose were used in the teaching of style and figures, it would seem to be inevitable that just as prose drew, with some reservations, upon poetry for certain figures and effects (cf. Quintilian X 1, 27 ff.; D'Alton, 445; Baldwin, 1-2), poetry, in turn, should adapt the rules and devices of oratory to suit its own purposes. The "rhetoricising" of poetry has, of

---

[11] Callimachus, Epigram 27 (ed. R. Pfeiffer), praises both Hesiod and Aratus, and observes that Aratus has imitated "τὸ μελιχρότατον τῶν ἐπέων" of Hesiod, a remark obviously concerned with style and expression.

[12] For the opinions of various critics and an argument urging the separation of rhetoric and poetry, see Howell, 374-390. The ancient critical view is discussed by Baldwin, 1-5 and *passim*. Cf. Hoyt H. Hudson, "Rhetoric and Poetry," *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*, ed. Raymond F. Howes (Ithaca 1961, rep. 1965), *passim*.

course, been observed in Ovid and later Roman poets, as well as in Euripides and in Hellenistic poets such as Theocritus, and, as the present study has shown, rhetorical elements were present in Roman poetry, i.e. in Lucretius, before the Augustan age.[13]

The union of poetry and rhetoric is especially evident in didactic verse such as the *De rerum natura*, for the author of such a work at least seems to intend to convey information to his audience and may adopt rhetorical devices to aid him in his task. Certainly not all didactic poetry conveys the sense of sincerety which the *De rerum natura* does, but one might expect a poet like Aratus, Empedocles, or Nicander to maintain some fiction of teaching, no matter how indigestible or overburdened with erudition his subject matter actually may be. Wishing to communicate with an audience perhaps more general or less intimate than that of a lyric poet, the author of a didactic epic might draw upon the theories of the rhetoricians in order to achieve the most effective arrangement of his material and the proper effect upon his audience.[14] Further, in

---

[13] Some might call Theocritus' *Idyll 17* "versified rhetoric", because of its obvious panegyrical intentions. For an analysis of the rhetorical topics in this idyll cf. Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972), 100-112; Georg Fraustadt, *Encomiorum in litteris Graecis usque ad Romanam aetatem historia* (Dissertation Leipzig 1909), 92. Cf. Hudson, 373, on the rhetorical implications of "writing an ode for a special occasion." One need not accept Hudson's opinion in its entirety, especially in view of such "occasional odes" as Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*. On the relationship between rhetoric and poetry, see also Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric*, 384-387, who mentions the "strong persuasive element" in Roman poetry. One should not ignore the presence of rhetorical elements in Lucretius' predecessors, Ennius and Lucilius.

[14] Hudson, 373, discusses the problem of the poet's audience and observes that "except for what has come to be called 'closet drama', the poet's work in this species [i.e. drama] is designed for an audience as surely as is the orator's. And in greater or lesser measure, the same holds true for other of the species of poetry- for narrative, for the ode, certainly for didactic and satirical pieces." Hudson thinks that the poet tends to think "of a more general and more vaguely defined audience than the orator." Certainly some intensely personal poetry *might* be considered as a form which little considers the general audience of future readers (cf. Hudson, 369, on poetry as soliloquy), although such a view of the poet and poetry may owe a strong debt to modern sensibilities and romantic literary theories (cf. Horace, *Odes* III 30, 1, for a contrasting opinion). Lyric poets, of course, are not necessarily immune to the influence of rhetoric (nor are they necessarily autobiographical).

One should note here that a didactic poet does not necessarily want to teach something. He may be writing for his own pleasure or fame or for the pleasure of others, but he may keep up a fiction of teaching in order to conform to the characteristics of his didactic genre. Further, one must

its connection with rhetoric and with concern for the instruction of an audience, the typical didactic poem would seem to be allied with those who claim instruction as the goal of poetry. As was noted above, however, the act of learning can be connected with aesthetic pleasure, and one should not assume that a didactic work itself cannot be beautiful poetry, containing charm (see footnote 8) and thus providing enjoyment, especially since the work of Lucretius serves as a lasting example of a successful fusion of instruction with poetic beauty, of rhetorical devices with effective poetry.[15] We, therefore, may dismiss those critics, ancient and modern, who limit poetry to non-didactic forms or who claim that poetry cannot be rhetorical, for such claims and limitations, while possibly valid for modern poetry, cannot be accepted uncritically by the student of ancient literature and certainly cannot be used as a pretense for ignoring either the rhetorical elements or the skillful poetic rendering of scientific "fact" within the *De rerum natura.*[16]

---

remember that not all didactic poetry deals with moral topics (cf. Nicander's works on "erudite" subjects), and that some didactic poems, therefore, may be more concerned with displaying the author's erudition than with actual instruction. Cf. Pierre Boyancé and J. H. Waszink, as cited below in footnote 15, for two views of Lucretius' intentions.

[15] The composition of a didactic epic could connect Lucretius with the Alexandrian tradition. For various opinions concerning Lucretius, the Alexandrians, and the purpose behind the writing of the *De rerum natura*, cf. Pierre Boyancé, "Lucrèce et la poésie," *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 49 (1947), 88-102; E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," 366-392; J. H. Waszink, "Lucretius and Poetry," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Afd. Letterkunde), Nieuwe Reeks 17, 8 (1954), 243-257.

[16] We are not attempting here to investigate the nature of poetry or to espouse some particular aesthetic theory. These remarks are intended only as a defense of didactic poetry and of the use of, and study of, rhetoric in poetry (when rhetoric is applied with good taste and proper restraint). The present study has employed what may be termed "rhetorical criticism" in showing some of the rhetorical elements which are present in Lucretius' poem and which support the idea of a connection between didactic poetry and rhetoric. On the term "rhetorical criticism," see Herbert A. Wichelns, "Some Differences between Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Criticism," in Howes, 217 ff.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

Aristotle, *Ars Poetica*, ed. R. Kassel, Oxford 1965.

——, *Ars Rhetorica*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford 1959.

——, *Rhetoric*, tr. W. Rhys Roberts, with an introduction by F. Solmsen, New York 1954.

Cicero, *De inventione*, ed. E. Stroebel, Teubner rep. 1965.

——, *Tusculanes*, ed. Georges Fohlen, with tr. by Jules Humbert (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 3rd. ed. 1964.

——, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, ed. M. Pohlenz, Teubner rep. 1965.

[Cicero], *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*), ed. Harry Caplan, Cambridge (Loeb) 1954.

——, *Incerti auctoris de ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium Lib. IV*, ed. Friedrich Marx, ed. ster. cor. by Winfried Trillitzsch, Teubner 1964.

Demetrius, ed. L. Radermacher, Teubner rep. 1967.

Diogenes Laertius, ed. H. S. Long, Oxford 1963.

Diogenes of Oenoanda, ed. C. W. Chilton, Teubner 1967.

Ennius, ed. E. H. Warmington, in *Remains of Old Latin*, I, Cambridge (Loeb) 1961.

Epicurus, tr. and commentary by Graziano Arrighetti, Torino (Nuova Universale Einaudi 88) 1970.

——, ed. with tr. and commentary by Cyril Bailey, in *Epicurus, the Extant Remains*, Oxford 1926.

——, ed. Hermann Usener, in *Epicurea*, Teubner 1887.

Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. Cambridge 1965.

Lucilius, ed. with German trans. by Werner Krenkel, 2 vols. Leiden 1970.

Lucretius, ed. with trans. and commentary by Cyril Bailey, 3 vols. Oxford 1947, rep. 1963.

——, ed. Karl Büchner, Wiesbaden 1966.

——, *Commentaire exégétique et critique*, Alfred Ernout and Léon Robin, 3 vols. Paris 1925, 2nd. ed. 1962.

——, *Buch III*, ed. with commentary by Richard Heinze (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern), Leipzig 1897.

——, *Book III*, ed. with commentary by E. J. Kenney (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge 1971.

——, ed. Joseph Martin, Teubner 1963.

Mackail, J. W. (ed. and tr.), *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, London 1906.

Paulson, J., *Index Lucretianus*, Leipzig 1926; rep. Darmstadt 1970.

Philodemus, *De Morte*, ed. Taco Kuiper (*Philodemus over den Dood*), Dissertation Amsterdam 1925.

——, *Volumina Rhetorica*, ed. Siegfried Sudhaus, 3 vols. Teubner, 1892-1896.

——, *The Rhetorica of Philodemus*, tr. and commentary by Harry M. Hubbell, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 23 (1926) 243-382.

[Plato], *Axiochus*, ed. Joseph Souilhé, in *Platon Oeuvres Complètes*, XIII (Collection des Universités de France), Paris 2nd. ed. 1962.
[Plutarch], *Consolatio ad Apollonium*, ed. J. Hani (Études et Commen. 78), Paris 1972.
Quintilian, ed. L. Radermacher, 2nd. ed. V. Buchheit, 2 vols., Teubner 1959.
Sternbach, Leo (ed.), *Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano graeco* 743 (Texte und Kommentare, eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 2), Berlin 1963.
Teles, ed. Otto Hense, Teubner 2nd. ed. 1909, rep. Hildesheim 1969.
Warmington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin*, 4 vols., Cambridge (Loeb) 1967.

B. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Abbott, F. F., "The Use of Repetition in Latin to Secure Emphasis, Intensity, and Distinctness of Expression," *Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 67-87.
Arbusow, Leonid, *Colores rhetorici, eine Auswahl rhetorischer Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten*, 2nd. ed. Helmut Peter, Göttingen 1963.
Atkins, J. W. H., *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, A *Sketch of its Development*, 2 vols., London 1952.
Bailey, Cyril, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus*, Oxford 1928.
——, "The Mind of Lucretius," *American Journal of Philology* 61 (1940), 278-291.
Baldwin, C. S., *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, Interpreted from Representative Works*, New York 1924.
Bignone, Ettore, *Storia della letteratura latina*, II, Firenze 1945.
Bocheński, I. M., *Ancient Formal Logic* (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics), Amsterdam 1951.
Bonner, S. F., *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool 1969.
Boyancé, Pierre, "La connaissance du Grec à Rome," *Revue des Études Latines* 34 (1956), 111-131.
——, "Lucrèce et la poésie," *Revue des Études Anciennes* 49 (1947), 88-102.
——, *Lucrèce et l'Épicurisme* (Les Grand Penseurs), Paris 1963.
——, "Lucrèce et son disciple," *Revue des Études Anciennes* 52 (1950), 212 ff.
Brescia, Cesare, *Ricerche sulla lingua e sullo stile di Epicuro* (Collana di Studi Greci 26), Napoli 1955.
Buchheit, Vincenz, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristotles*, München 1960.
Büchner, Karl, *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez*, Dissertation Leipzig 1936.
——, "Über den Aufbau von Beweisreihen im Lukrez," *Philologus* 92 (1937), 68-82.
Bultmann, Rudolf, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt u. die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Forschungen zur Religion u. Kultur des Alten u. Neuen Test. 13), Göttingen 1910.
Buresch, Carl, *Consolationum a graecis romanisque scriptarum historia critica* (Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie 9), Leipzig 1886.
Burgess, Theodore C., "Epideictic Literature," *Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 89-261.
Cairns, Francis, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh 1972.

Capelle, W., "Diatribe," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1957), 990-997.
Cèbe, Jean-Pierre, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines à Juvénal* (Bibliotheque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome fasc. 206), Paris 1966.
Clarke, M. L., *Higher Education in the Ancient World*, London 1971.
——, "Rhetorical Influences in the Aeneid," *Greece and Rome* 18 (1949), 14-27.
——, *Rhetoric at Rome, A Historical Survey*, London 1953.
——, "The *Thesis* in the Roman Rhetorical Schools of the Republic," *Classical Quarterly* 1 (1951), 159 ff.
Classen, C. J., "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc.* 99 (1968), 77-118.
Conrad, C. W., "Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 69 (1965), 195-258.
Conte, G.-B., "Il 'trionfo della morte' e la galleria dei grandi trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024/1053," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 37 (1965), 114-132.
——, "'Ὕψος e diatriba nello stile di Lucrezio (De Rer. Nat. II, 1-61)," *Maia* 18 (1966), 338-368.
Cousin, J., "Lucrèce, les verseuses et la *vita stultorum* (de. nat. rer., III 1003 sq.)," *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire offerts à Alfred Ernout*, Paris 1940, 97-106.
Cox, A. S., "Lucretius and his Message, a Study in the Prologues of the De Rerum Natura," *Greece and Rome* 18 (1971), 1-16.
Cumont, Franz, "Lucrèce et le symbolisme pythagoricien des enfers," *Revue de Philologie* 45 (1920), 229-240.
D'Alton, J. F., *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism, a Study in Tendencies*, London 1931, rep. ed. 1962.
Dalzell, Alexander, "A Bibliography of Work on Lucretius, 1945-1972," *Classical World* 66 (1973), 385-427, and 67(1973), 65-112.
De Lacy, P. H., "Lucretius and the History of Epicureanism," *TAPA* 79 (1948), 12-23.
——, "Stoic Views of Poetry," *American Journal of Philology* 69 (1948), 241-271.
——, and E. A. De Lacy (eds.), *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference, A Study in Ancient Empiricism* (Philological Monographs pub. by the American Philological Assoc.), Philadelphia 1941.
Deutsch, Rosamund E., *The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius*, Thesis Bryn Mawr 1939.
Dudley, D. R., *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.*, London 1937.
——, "The Satiric Element in Lucretius," *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London 1965, 115-130.
Dutoit, E., *Le thème de l'adynaton dans la poésie antique*, Paris 1936.
Esteve-Forriol, José, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, Untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz*, Dissertation Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, München 1962.
Farrington, Benjamin, "Form and Purpose in the De Rerum Natura," *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London 1965.
——, *The Faith of Epicurus*, London 1967.

Fern, Sr. Mary E., *The Latin Consolatio as a Literary Type*, rev. Dissertation St. Louis University 1941.
Festugière, A. J., *Epicurus and his Gods*, tr. C. W. Chilton, Oxford 1955.
Fiske, G. C., *Lucilius and Horace, A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 7), Madison 1920.
Friedländer, Paul, "Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius," in *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin 1969, 337-353.
Fuks, Alexander, "Non-Phylarchean Tradition of the Programme of Agis IV," *Classical Quarterly* 56 (1962), 118 ff.
Geffcken, Johannes, *Kynika und Verwandtes*, Heidelberg 1909.
Gigante, Marcello, *Ricerche Filodemee* (Biblioteca della Parola del Passato 6), Napoli 1969.
Guiffrida, Pasquale, *L'Epicureismo nella letteratura latina nel I secolo a.c.*, 2 vols., Torino 1940.
Grant, Mary A., *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable, The Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 21), Madison 1924.
Grimal, Pierre, "Lucrèce et son public," *Revue des Études Latines* 41 (1963), 91-100.
Grimaldi, W. M. A., S. J., *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Hermes Einzelschriften 25), Wiesbaden 1972.
Grube, G. M. A., *The Greek and Roman Critics*, London 1965.
Guillemin, A. M., *Le public et la vie littéraire à Rome* (Collection d'Études Latines), Paris 1937.
Gwynn, Aubrey, S. J., *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*, Oxford 1926.
Heinze, Richard, *De Horatio Bionis imitatore*, Dissertation Bonn 1889.
Herescu, N. I., *La poésie latine, étude des structures phoniques*, Paris 1960.
Herter, Hans, "Demokrit über das Alter," *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N. F. I (1975; *Festschrift Ernst Siegmann*), 83-92.
——, "Zur Ersten Satire des Horaz," *Rheinisches Museum* N. S. 94 (1951), 1-41.
Highet, Gilbert, *The Anatomy of Satire*, Princeton 1962.
Howell, W. S., "Rhetoric and Poetics: a Plea for the Recognition of the Two Literatures," *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. Luitpold Wallach, Ithaca 1966, 374-390.
Howes, Raymond F. (ed.), *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*, Ithaca 1961, reissued 1965.
Hubbell, Harry M., "Isocrates and the Epicureans," *Classical Philology* 11 (1916), 404 ff.
Hudson, Hoyt, "Rhetoric and Poetry," *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*, ed. Raymond F. Howes (cf. above), 369-379.
Immisch, Otto, *Philologische Studien zu Plato*, I, *Axiochus*, Leipzig 1896.
Ingalls, W. B., "Repetition in Lucretius," *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 227-236.
Kassel, Rudolf, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* (Zetemata 18), München 1958.
Kenney, E. J., "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne* ser. IV., 23 (1970), 366-392.
Kennedy, George, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton 1963.
——, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*, Princeton 1972.

Kneale, William and Martha Kneale, *The Development of Logic*, Oxford rep. 1964.
Knögel, Wilhelm, *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 5), Leipzig 1933.
Kohl, Richard, *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis* (Rhetorische Studien 4), Paderborn 1915.
Konstan, David, *Some Aspects of Epicurean Psychology* (Philosophia Antiqua 25), Leiden 1973.
Koster, Severin, *Antike Epostheorien* (Palingenesia 5), Wiesbaden 1970.
Kraetsch, Emil, *De abundanti dicendi genere Lucretiano*, Dissertation Berlin 1881.
Kroll, Wilhelm, "Das Epicheirema" (Akademie der Wissenschaft. in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, *Sitzungsberichte* 216, 2), Wien 1936.
——, "Rhetorik", *RE Supp.* VII, 1039-1138, 1947.
Lattimore, Richmond, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962.
Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 2 vols., München 1960.
Lavagnini, Bruno, "Motivi diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale," *Athenaeum* N. S. 25 (1947), 83-88.
Leeman, A. D., *Orationis Ratio, The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1963.
Lelièvre, F. J., "The Basis of Ancient Parody," *Greece and Rome* ser. 2 1 (1954), 66-81.
Maguiness, W. S., "The Language of Lucretius," *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London 1965.
Marrou, H. I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, tr. George Lamb, New York 1964.
Martha, Constant, *Le poëme de Lucrèce, Morale-religion-science*, Paris 4th. ed. 1885.
Martin, Josef, *Antike Rhetorik, Technik und Methode* (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II, 3, 1974).
McCarthy, Barbara P., "The Form of Varro's Menippean Satires," *Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller*, ed. Rodney P. Robinson (The University of Missouri Studies 11, 1936), 95-107.
Meister, Martin, *De Axiocho dialogo*, Dissertation Breslau 1915.
Mendell, C. W., "Satire as Popular Philosophy," *Classical Philology* 15 (1920), 138-157.
Merbach, F., *De Epicuri canonica*, Dissertation Leipzig 1909.
Merill, W. A., "The Characteristics of Lucretius' Verse," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 7 (1924).
Michel, Alain, "Éclectisme philosophique et lieux communs: à propos de la 'diatribe romaine'," *Latomus* 70 (*Hommages à Jean Bayet*), 1964, 485-494.
——, "Rhétorique, philosophie et esthétique generale: de Cicéron à Eupalinos," *Revue des Études Latines* 52 (1973), 302-326.
Michels, Agnes K., "Death and Two Poets," *TAPA* 86 (1955), 160-171.
Modrze, Annelise, "Teles," *RE* Ser. 2, 5 A part I, 1934, 375-382.
Murley, Clyde, "Lucretius and the History of Satire," *TAPA* 70 (1939), 380-395.
——, "Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Viewed as Epic," *TAPA* 78 (1947), 336-346.
Musso, Olimpio, "Telete e la battaglia di Efeso," *La Parola del Passato* 82 (1962), 129-131.

Norden, Eduard, *Die antike Kunstprose, von VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1909.

Oltramare, André, *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*, Lausanne 1926.

Otto, A., *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, gesammelt und erklärt*, Hildesheim rep. 1971.

Owen, W. H., "Structural Patterns in Lucretius' De Rerum Natura I," *Classical World* 62 (1968), 121-127.

Phillipson, Robert, Review of André Oltramare, *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*, *Gnomon* 3 (1927), 727-729.

Poteat, H. M., *Repetition in Latin Poetry with Special Reference to the Metrical Treatment of Repeated Words*, Dissertation Columbia, New York 1912.

Radermacher, Ludwig, *Weinen und Lachen, Studien über antikes Lebensgefühl*, Wien 1947.

Rahn, Helmut, *Morphologie der antiken Literatur, eine Einführung* (Die Altertumswissenschaft, Einführungen in Gegenstand, Methoden und Ergebnisse ihrer Teildisziplinen und Hilfswissenschaften), Darmstadt 1969.

Rand, E. K., "La composition rhétorique du troisième livre de Lucrèce," *Revue de Philologie* 60 (1934), 243-266.

Regenbogen, Otto "Lukrez, seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht" in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Franz Dirlmeier München 1961, 296-386.

Reichel, Georg, *Quaestiones Progymnasmaticae*, Leipzig 1909.

Rist, J. M., *Epicurus, An Introduction*, Cambridge 1972.

Russell, D. A., and M. Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism, The Principal Texts in New Translations*, Oxford 1972.

Schenkeveld, D. M., "OI KPITIKOI in Philodemus," *Mnemosyne* 21 (1968), 176-214.

Schmid, Wolfgang, "Epikur," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1963), 681-819.

Schmidt, E. G., "Diatribai," *Der kleine Pauly* II (Stuttgart 1967), 1577-1578.

——. "Diatribe und Satire," *Römische Satire* (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 15), 1966, 507-515.

Schrijvers, P. H., *Horror ac divina voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce*, Amsterdam 1970.

Sellar, W. Y., *The Roman Poets of the Republic*, Oxford, re-issue of the 3rd. ed. 1905.

Sikes, E. E., *Lucretius, Poet and Philosopher*, Cambridge 1936.

Solmsen, Friedrich, "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings," *Kleine Schriften*, II, Hildesheim 1968, 216-230.

——, "Epicurus and Cosmological Heresies," *Kleine Schriften*, I, Hildesheim, 1968, 461-483.

——, "Epicurus on the Growth and Decline of the Cosmos," *Kleine Schriften*, I, Hildesheim 1968, 484-501.

Stählin, G., "Trost und Tröster in der ausserbiblischen Antike," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Test.* 5 (1954), 771-798.

Steckel, Horst, "Epikuros," *RE Supp.* XI (Stuttgart 1968), 579-652.

Stocks, J. L., "Epicurean Induction," *Mind* 34 (1925), 185-203.

Stork, Traudel, *Nil igitur mors est ad nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuchs und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur*, Bonn 1970.

Throm, Hermann, *Die Thesis, ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte* (Rhetorische Studien 17), Paderborn 1932.

Traglia, Antonio, *Sulla formazione spirituale di Lucrezio*, Roma 1948.

Vallette, P., "Lucrèce et la diatribe," *Revue des Études Anciennes* 42 (1940), 532-541.
Van Geytenbeek, A. C., *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe*, tr. B. L. Hijmans, Jr. (Wijsgerige Teksten en Studies 8), Assen rev. ed. 1963.
Van Rooy, C. A., *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*, Leiden 1966.
Von Arnim, Hans, "Bion," *RE* III, 1 (1897), 483-485.
Von Mueller, Heinrich, *De Teletis elocutione*, Dissertation Freiburg 1891.
Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Philologische Untersuchungen 4), Berlin 1881.
——, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums*, in *Die lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (Die Kultur der Gegenwart I, 8), Leipzig 1912.
Wallach, Barbara P., *A History of the Diatribe from its Origin up to the First Century B.C. and a Study of the Influence of the Genre upon Lucretius, III, 830-1094*, Dissertation University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1974.
——, "Lucretius and the Diatribe: De rerum natura II. 1-61," *Festschrift für Luitpold Wallach, Gesellschaft-Kultur-Literatur: Rezeption und Originalität im Wachsen einer europäischen Literatur und Geistigkeit*, ed. Karl Bosl, Stuttgart (1975), 49-77.
——, Review of Lawrence Giangrande, *The Use of Spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature* (The Hague, 1972), *American Journal of Philology* 96 (1975), 211-214.
Wallach, Luitpold(ed.), *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, Ithaca 1966.
Waltz, René, "Lucrèce Satirique," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé, Supplement: Lettres d'Humanité* 8 (1949), 78-103.
——, "Lucrèce dans Lucrèce," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé, Supplement: Lettres d'Humanité* 12 (1953), 43-63.
Waszink, J. H., "Lucretius and Poetry," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 17, 8, Amsterdam (1954), 243-257.
——, "Zum Exkurs des Lukrez über Glaube und Aberglaube (V 1194-1240)," *Wiener Studien* 79 (1966), 308-313.
Wendland, Paul, *Philo und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie und Religion), Berlin 1895.
West, David, *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*, Edinburgh 1969.
Wichelns, Herbert A., "Some Differences between Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Criticism," *Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians*, ed. Raymond F. Howes, Ithaca 1961.
Widmann, Hans, *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 24), Stuttgart 1935.
Wilkinson, L. P., "Philodemus and Poetry," *Greece and Rome* 2 (1933), 144-151.
Witke, Charles, *Latin Satire, The Structure of Persuasion*, Leiden 1970.
Woltjer, Jan, *Lucreti philosophia cum fontibus comparata*, Dissertation Groningen 1877.
——, "Studia Lucretiana," *Mnemosyne* 24 (1896), 62-71.
Wormell, D. E. W., "The Personal World of Lucretius," *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London 1965.

GENERAL INDEX

Academics, Academy 89, 90-91
Acheron 86, 88
Achilles 92-93
adiunctio 83
adnominatio 30, 44; see paronomasia
adynaton 26-27
Aeneid 96
Aesclepiades 57
Aesop 73
aesthetic, aesthetics 110, 113-114, 116
Afranius 111
Alcaeus 57
Alexandrians 1, 52, 113-114, 116; see Aratus, Eratosthenes
allegory, allegorical 85-90
alliteration 29-30, 34, 43-44, 61, 66-68, 91, 97, 100, 108
Amphis 57
amplificatio, amplification 44-45, 47, 49, 60, 82, 91, 106
analogy 14, 17-20, 22, 58-61, 79-81, 102, 107; see arguments, Epicurean
anaphora 30, 66, 68, 77, 83, 91, 96
anecdote 7, 16, 37-38, 80
anima, see soul; topics, Epicurean
Annales, see Ennius
antithesis 7, 29-30, 53-54, 68, 95-96
anxiety 97; see fear
ἀπάθεια, apathy 55, 103, 106; see indifference
Apollonides 57
apostrophe 48
apothegm 7, 42; see proverbial statements
appeal to pity 49
Aratus 111, 114-115
arguments
 arrangement of 23
 Epicurean 13-14, 20, 22-24, 58-59, 107
 in Lucretius 11-15, 17, 19, 20-24, 28, 30-32, 42, 45, 54, 81-82, 103, 107-108
 rhetorical 13-14, 20, 23-24, 28, 30-31, 42, 45, 81-82, 107-108
 see analogy; Philodemus; proofs; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*
argumentum ex silentio 86
Ariston of Ceos 98
Aristotle
 on analogy 14
 Ars rhetorica 20, 72, 113
 De interpretatione 24
 and examples 16
 Nicomachean Ethics 16
 on old age 72-73
 on pleasure 113-114
 Poetics 110, 113
 on poetry 110, 113-114
 on proverbs 27
 on rhetoric 3, 20
 on rhetorical arguments 20
arrangement 81; see arguments, arrangement of
assonance 29
asyndeton 44, 53, 76-77, 83, 100
ἀταραξία 55, 99
Athenaeus 57
atoms 21, 27, 59, 78; see topics, Epicurean
audience 28, 30-33, 35-36, 38, 58, 77, 81, 94, 103, 115-116
 enlisting sympathy of 32
 familiar with device used 16, 27, 36, 43-44, 75
 as listeners 4
 maintaining attention of 66
 for poetry 115-116
 type expected by Lucretius 4
αὔξησις 97
αὐτάρκεια, autarchy 56, 81, 103; see themes, diatribal
Axiochus 15-16, 18-19, 32, 42, 51, 99

Bailey, C. 1-2, 21-22, 38, 41-42, 46, 55, 60, 64, 72, 74, 77, 82, 85-87, 92, 101-102
banquet, quitting life as one leaving a, see themes, diatribal
baratre 54, 71, 75, 95; see interlocutor, imaginary; *stultus*

Bignone, E. 74
Bion of Borysthenes
on acceptance of death 65
and Aristotle 73
on brevity of life 56
and Cicero 38-39
and consolation 38, 94, 106-107 109
on contentment 72
and Crantor 39
on death resembling sleep 56, 59, 79-80
developer of diatribe 11
on διδασκαλίας of death 59, 79
on dissatisfaction 64, 69-70
enumeration in 33, 36, 40-41, 43
and the Epicureans 43, 72
on fate of corpse 33, 36, 38-41, 55, 106
on Fortune 78-79
fragments of as examples of diatribe 8, 11
on greed 104
on grief 54-55
and Horace 8
on indifference of dead 50-51, 55
influence on Lucretius 17, 33, 36-41, 43, 50-51, 54-56, 61-70, 72-80, 89-91, 94, 106-109
on old age 72-73
and *parrhesia* 61
Περὶ ταφῆς 39, 41, 43, 50, 55
and Philodemus 43, 50-51
and *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* 33, 61-68, 70, 77, 80-81, 107
on quitting life as leaving a banquet 64
quotation of poetry by 36-37
and rationalization of myths 89, 108
ridicule by 106-107, 109
and *spoudaiogeloion* 55, 108-109
style of 51, 60, 65-68, 76, 79-81, 107
and Tantalus myth 89-90
and Teles 19, 36, 38, 56, 61-62, 64, 69-70, 80-81, 89-90, 94, 109
and Theophrastus 73
see diatribe; Teles; themes, diatribal
body, disposal or burial of 30-31, 37-43
Bonner, S. F. 16
Boyancé, P. 1, 19, 90-91
brevity 29, 44, 76
brevity of life 56-57, 74, 102
Büchner, K. 10
Bultmann, R. 7
Buresch, C. 39
burial
concern for 30-35, 37-38, 40-42, 45, 106
forms of 33, 38, 40-43, 106
see themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory

caesura 44
Callimachus 114
Capelle, W. 7
Caplan, H. 2, 14; see *Rhetorica ad Herennium*
Carmen Saeculare, see Horace
Cerberus 85-86
Characteres, see Theophrastus
characterismos 32, 97-99; see character sketches
character sketches 7, 32-33, 36, 91, 98-101, 107-108; see *notatio*
chiasmus, chiastic arrangement 29, 44, 60-61, 83, 91, 100-101
Chrysippus 39-41, 89
Cicero
on appeal to pity, *conquestio* 49
and Bion 38-40
and Chrysippus 39-40
Consolatio 39
and consolation literature 17-18, 39-40
and Crantor 17-18, 39-40
De finibus 13, 27, 65
De inventione 3, 9, 14, 49
De oratore 111
and diatribe 18-19, 38-40
on Diogenes of Sinope 37-38
on Epicureans and style 5
on life as a loan 78
and Lucretius 17-19, 38-40
on Pacuvius 34-35, 38
Philippics 56
on poetry 110-111
and Posidonius 17-18, 39-40
Pro Archia 111
on quitting life as leaving a banquet 64-65
on rhetorical arguments 14
Tusculan Disputations 16-18, 25,

34, 37-40, 51, 59, 64-65, 78
clarity, clear expression 87
Classen, C. J. 4-5, 9-10, 24-25
cola 76; see isocolon
commiseratio 49; see appeal to pity
common opinion 46, 56, 104, 106; see interlocutor, imaginary
comparisons 7, 36, 40-41; see simile
concern, lack of 21-23, 27, 42, 49-51, 55, 58
conclusio, conclusion 22-23, 25, 31, 49, 81-82, 102-103; see *conplexio*
conduplicatio 47
confirmatio 25
confirmation, see *rationis confirmatio*
conformatio 61; see *prosopopoiia*
confutatio 25
congeries 47
coniunctio 29, 44, 68, 76, 83, 100
conplexio 13, 23, 82
conquestio 49-50; see appeal to pity
consolatio, consolation literature 11, 16-20, 25, 36-40, 47, 50-51, 53, 55-56, 59, 78-80, 92-94, 104, 106-109; see *Axiochus*; *epicedion*; inscriptions, tomb; topics, consolatory
Consolatio ad Apollonium 40, 59, 79, 93, 108
consolatio in *epicedion* 78, 93
Conte, G.-B. 10, 13, 94-97
corpse, disposal of, see burial
Crantor 17-18, 39-40, 79
Crates 94, 99
crescendo 29, 96
Croesus 93
Cynics 18, 38, 40-42, 50, 61, 69-70; see diatribe; Diogenes of Sinope; themes, diatribal
Cynic-Stoic diatribe, see diatribe

D'Alton, J. F. 2, 5, 110-111
Danaids 84, 88, 91
death
- inevitable 30, 92, 102
- not unique 93
- readiness for 74
- see sleep, death as; themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory

declamation 6
Deiphilus 34-37
DeLacy, P. H. and E. A. 14, 59
Demetrius 13
Democritus 41, 72, 86-87, 89
descriptio 60
descriptio funeris et sepulcri 51
desire
- insatiable 90
- irrational 84
- see concern; themes, diatribal

dialogue 6-7, 15, 19, 46, 54, 98, 107
diatribal themes, see themes, diatribal
diatribe
- and consolation literature 18, 38
- definition of 6
- and diatribal 8
- function of 66
- list of traits 6-7
- and Lucretius 4, 6-11, 16-20, 25-26, 29-30, 32-33, 36-43, 45-46, 50-51, 54-56, 58-68, 70-83, 89-91, 93-97, 99-101, 103-109
- in poetic form 8, 106
- studies concerning 6-8, 10
- style of 6-7, 10, 29, 33, 36-38, 43, 55-56, 59-61, 63-68, 71, 74-77, 79-83, 91, 94-97, 99-101, 103-108
- themes of—see themes, diatribal
- use of the term 7-8
- see Bion of Borysthenes; Teles

Dicaearchus 39
didactic 21, 25, 30, 46, 68, 79, 83, 100, 109-110, 113-116
didactic epic 8-9, 25, 115-116
διδασκαλία, rehearsal, lesson 59, 79
Diogenes Laertius 4-5, 40, 42, 51, 55, 61, 72-73
Diogenes of Oenoanda 42, 86
Diogenes of Sinope 37-38, 40, 50, 61, 80, 89, 94
Dionysius (poet) 52
Diotimus 52
discidium 14, 18; see dissolution; topics, Epicurean
discontent 97; see dissatisfaction; themes, diatribal
dissatisfaction 64, 66, 81, 84, 90, 93, 99, 104, 108; see μεμψιμοιρία; themes, diatribal

dissolution 21, 78; see separation; topics, Epicurian
divisio 25
doctrine, Epicurean, see topics, Epicurean
Dudley, D. R. 1
dulces 47-48; see sentimentalism
Dutoit, E. 26-27

education, rhetorical 9, 114; see Quintilian
elaboration, see *exornatio*
embellishment 31, 81; see *exornatio*
Empedocles 110-112, 114-115
emphasis 68, 76, 91, 97, 100-101
enargeia 60
enjambment 60-61
enjoyment of life 57
Ennius 28, 34, 95, 99, 115; see irony; parody
enthymeme 13
enumeratio 25-26, 102-103
enumeration 25, 33, 36-37, 40-41, 43-44, 107-108
epic style, see style, epic
epicedion 47, 49-51, 56, 78, 93, 106; see *consolatio*
epicheireme 13-14, 20; see arguments, rhetorical
Epictetus 8
Epicurean arguments, see arguments Epicurean
Epicurean psychology 87
Epicureans
  and Bion 43
  and rhetoric 4-6, 20
Epicurus
  on allegory and punishment after death 86-87
  on astral gods 87
  on burial 42
  Canonice 22
  on cycle of destruction 21
  as example 65, 95
  on grief 51, 54-55
  Kuriai Doxai 12, 70, 87, 99
  on leaving life as one leaving a banquet 64-65
  Letter to Herodotus 87, 89
  Letter to Menoeceus 5-6, 24, 42, 55, 65, 99, 104
  and rationalization of myths 86-89
  and rhetoric 4-6
  Sent. Vat. 65, 73-74
  as source 64-65, 69-70, 72, 74, 86
  style of 5, 24
  on suicide 65
  see Lucretius, sources for; topics, Epicurean
epideictic oratory, see oratory, epideictic
epigram 47, 51-52, 57, 107
epilogue 25, 103
epiphonema 13, 91
epitaphs 18-19, 47, 49, 51; see inscriptions, tomb
epithets 96
Eratosthenes 110, 113
Ernout, A., and Robin, L. 11, 15, 34, 39
ἔσχατόν [τι] τῶν κακῶν 70
Esteve-Forriol, J. 47, 51, 104
eternity 100, 102, 106
ethics, poetry and, see poetry
etymology, etymological figure 48, 67, 91
Euhemerus 89
Euripides 36, 99, 115
evidence to the contrary, see arguments, Epicurean
exaggeration 49, 53, 57, 96
examples, *exempla*
  historical 15-16, 92, 94
  legendary 104-105
  mythological 91
  negative 88, 91
exhortative tone 66
exile 48, 106; see themes, diatribal
exordium 24-25
exornatio 13, 21-22, 31, 82
explanations, rational, see rational explanations
expository style, see style, expository

fable 7, 73
family 47-48, 50-51
Farrington, B. 4
fear 21, 28, 32-35, 37-38, 42, 82, 84, 86-88, 95, 99, 106, 108; see themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory
fiction, poetry as, see poetry as fiction

Fiske, G. C. 69
forensic speech 49
formulae 63
Fortune 78-79; see themes, diatribal
Furies 85

Gnomologium Vaticanum 42, 59, 79-80
Görler, W. 17
greed, greedy 72-73; 104; see themes, diatribal
Greek Anthology 52, 57
grief 51, 53-56, 106; see Epicurus; themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory
Grube, G. M. A. 111
guilty imagination 87

Hades 86, 89
Hannibal, 16; see Punic War
Heinze, R. 19, 26-28, 50, 85-86, 98, 103
Hense, O. 8
Heraclides Ponticos 41
Hermarchus 5
Herter, H. iii, 18, 72, 74
Hesiod 8, 113-114
Homer 16, 37, 89, 92-93, 110-111
homily, homiletic tone 100, 109
homoeoptoton 29, 60, 67-68, 76, 96, 105; see *similiter cadens*
homoeoteleuton 44, 57, 59-61, 66-68, 76, 91, 96, 100, 105; see *similes exitus*
Horace
  and Bion 8, 65
  and the diatribe 8, 65
  on poetry 111, 115
  Sermones 8, 64
Hudson, H. 114-115
humor 33, 45, 75, 108-109; see *spoudaiogeloion*
Hunt, E. L. 3
hyperbaton 29; see *transgressio*
hyperbole 28-29, 53-54, 91

Iliona 34, 36, 38; see Deiphilus; Pacuvius
imagery, legal, see legal imagery
imitation 28, 33-35, 37, 65-66, 95-96, 113
imperatives 71, 75-76, 82
improbe 95
independence, see αὐτάρκεια
indifference, apathy, see ἀπάθεια; concern
induction, inductive process 14, 92
inference 14, 59
ingratitude 84, 90
inscriptions, tomb 47, 49, 51-54, 57, 78, 93, 106; see epitaphs
insensibility
  before birth 16, 79
  after death 16, 19, 23, 79-80
  see themes, diatribal; topics, Epicurean; unconsciousness
instruction 66, 98, 110-113, 115-116
interlocutor, imaginary 6-7, 17, 21, 32, 36, 44, 45-47, 49, 51, 53-54, 56-60, 63, 66, 71, 75, 77, 91-94, 96, 104-108; see *baratre*; *stultus*; φησί
introduction 13, 25-26
irony 26, 28-29, 31, 96, 106-107
isocolon 67-68, 76, 83, 96-97, 106-107
Ixion 86

Juvenal 16, 27, 94

Kennedy, G. 16, 115
Kenney, E. J. 9-10, 15, 21, 23, 25-26, 28-29, 31-33, 43, 47, 51-54, 59, 60, 65, 70, 77, 84, 99, 103, 108
Krenkel, W. 69
Kuriai Doxai, see Epicurus

Lactantius 86-87
lamentatio, lamentation 47, 49-51; see *epicedion*
Lattimore, R. 47, 53, 78
laudatio funebris 47, 50; see orations, funeral
Lavagnini, B. 10, 94
Leeman, A. D. 105
legal imagery 63, 78
legends 86-91, 108
Leonidas of Tarentum 52, 96
licentia 61
life as a loan, see themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory
listener 4, 33, 44, 82, 95, 100-101; see audience
loci communes 41; see topics, common

Lucilius 69-70, 115
Lucretius
and Cicero 4, 17-19, 38-40
and the diatribe—see diatribe and Lucretius
education of 9, 16, 24-25, 98-99
rhetoric in—see rhetoric in Lucretius
satire in 1, 9; see satire
sources for or influences on:
Axiochus 15-20
commonplaces 15, 18, 27-28, 31, 39-41, 53-54, 56-57, 64-65, 72-73, 78-79, 92-93, 99
consolation literature 17-20, 25, 38-40, 51-55, 59, 78-79, 93-94, 104, 106-107
diatribe 16-19, 33, 36-41, 43, 50-51, 54-56, 59, 61-75, 77-81, 85, 89-91, 93-95, 103-104, 106-108
Epicurean 12-13, 19-20, 23-24, 42-43, 51, 54-56, 59, 64-65, 69-70, 72-74, 80, 85-90, 99
general comments 24-26, 40-41, 55-56, 65
philosophical, non-Epicurean 90-91, 98-99
poetry 27-29, 34-37, 46-47, 57, 69-70, 92-93
rhetorical 15-16, 24-26, 49-50, 72-73, 98-99
see arguments in Lucretius; Bion of Borysthenes
Lycaon 92
lyric poetry 111, 115

Macer, Aemilius 113
malefactors 83-84, 89-90, 108; see punishment after death
Marcovich, M. iii
maxims 76, 82; see proverbial statements
Medea 89
medley, diatribe as 81, 108
Memmius 4, 99
μεμψιμοιρία 69-71, 73, 99; see dissatisfaction; themes, diatribal
Menander 111
Menippus 41
metrical efefcts 43-44, 54; see words, position of
Metrodorus 5, 74
μίμησις 110, 114
monologue 94
moralizing 80-81, 83, 85, 89, 100-101, 108
morality, poetry and, see poetry and morality
mourning 51, 54; see *consolatio*; themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory
Murley, C. 1, 69
Musonius Rufus 8
myths 85, 87-91, 108

narratio 25
Natura, nature 54, 61, 63-66, 68-73, 75-77, 82-83, 101
Nausiphanes 6, 14
Nicander 112, 115-116
Norden, E. 6-7
notatio 98

Odyssey 37, 96
old giving way for the new 81
old man, foolish 71-72, 75-76, 81, 101; see interlocutor, imaginary
Oltramare, A. 10, 37, 40, 55, 59, 64-66, 72, 79-80, 90, 93-94, 99, 103-104
opponent, imaginary, see interlocutor, imaginary
orations, funeral 46-47, 50-51
orator 115
oratory
deliberative 25
epideictic 5
judicial 25
Otto, A. 56
Ovid 48-49, 115
oxymoron 29-30, 106

Pacuvius 34-38, 40; see Cicero; Deiphilus; *Iliona*
palingenesia 21
panegyrical 5, 115
parallelism 60, 67, 106
Parmenides 112
parody 7, 28-29, 33-34, 36-37, 46-47, 49-51, 53-54, 57-58, 60-61, 95-96, 107-108
paronomasia 67; see *adnominatio*
parrhesia 61
Penia 33, 62, 64-68, 70, 77, 80-81; see Bion of Borysthenes; *prosopopoiia*

Peripatetic 73, 98-99; see Theophrastus
periphrases, epic 96
permutatio 88
peroratio 25, 102
personification 7, 66, 70, 75, 77; see *prosopopoiia*
persuasion 114-115
Phaedrus 73
Phaethon 87
φησί 6, 32, 75, 94; see interlocutor, imaginary
Philo of Alexandria 90
Philodemus
  and Bion 43, 50, 51
  De ira 8, 43, 98
  De morte 8, 18, 42-43, 50, 64, 74
  and diatribe 8, 50-51
  On Methods of Inference 14
  Περὶ κακιῶν 98
  Περὶ ποιημάτων 110
  on poetry 110-111
  on rhetoric 5
  Volumina Rhetorica 5
  see analogy; arguments, Epicurean
φιλοπλουτία 69-71
pity, appeal to, see appeal to pity
platitudes, see proverbial statements
Plato, Platonic 15-16, 32, 34, 59, 90; see *Axiochus*
Plautus 56, 73
pleasure, nature of 113-114; see Aristotle
pleasure, poetry as, see poetry as pleasure
Plutarch 112-113
poetic quotations, see poetry, quotation of
poetry, educational value of 110-114
  and ethics 110-113
  as fiction 111-113
  function of 110-116
  and morality 110-113, 116
  parodies of 7, 28, 33-37, 96
  and philosophy 112-113
  as pleasure 110-116
  quotation of 7, 33-34, 36-38, 40, 95
  and rhetoric 110-111, 113-116
  subject matter of 110-112, 114-116
  see Aristotle; diatribe; Horace; Plutarch; Quintilian
polemic, anti-Epicurean 19; see *Axiochus*
polemical tone, polemic 7, 33, 65-66, 75, 91, 93-97, 100, 106-108
'political failure' 84
Polydorus 34; see Deiphilus; *Iliona*
polysyndeton 60
Posidonius 17-18, 39-40; see Cicero; Crantor
power, political 90
primordia 58; see topics, Epicurean
prooemia 24-25, 37, 45, 74, 96
proofs
  arrangement of 23-24
  in Lucretius 13-15, 17, 20-24, 31, 81-82
  as part of a speech 25
  see arguments, in Lucretius; arguments, rhetorical
Propertius 82
propositio, proposition 13, 21, 30, 81; see arguments, in Lucretius; arguments, rhetorical
prosopopoiia 33, 61-68, 70-71, 75-77, 80-81, 83, 91, 101, 107; see Bion of Borysthenes; *Natura*; *Penia*; personification
proverbial statements 26-29, 56, 73, 76, 82, 104, 107; see apothegm
Ps.-Plato, see *Axiochus*
Ps.-Plutarch 59, 79, 93, 108; see *Consolatio ad Apollonium*
Publilius Syrus 56
Punic War 14, 16, 28; see examples, historical; Hannibal
punishment after death 81, 83, 85-88, 91, 108; see Democritus; Epicurus; Lactantius; rational explanations
puns 91
Pythagoreans 89-91

questions, rhetorical, see rhetorical questions
Quintilian on
  adnominatio 30
  amplificatio 44-45
  appeal to pity 50
  congeries 47
  the *epicheireme* 13-14, 20
  the *epiphonema* 13

Epicurus and rhetoric 4
homoeoteleuton 44, 105
Lucretius 113
poetry 111-114
rhetorical questions 54
school authors 111-113
wordplays 30, 44

Rahn, H. 7-8
Rand, E. K. 10, 25
ratio, reason 13, 21, 30, 81; see arguments, in Lucretius; arguments, rhetorical
rational explanations, rationalization 87-91, 108; see allegory; Bion of Borysthenes; Epicurus; Democritus
rationis confirmatio 13, 31; see arguments, in Lucretius; proofs, in Lucretius
readers 4, 26, 32, 99; see audience
reductio ad absurdum 27, 31, 105, 107-108
refutation rejection, 25, 54, 75
Reichel, G. 9
repetition 23, 30; see alliteration; didactic
restlessness, restless man 97-101; see character sketch; dissatisfaction; μεμψιμοιρία
rhetoric
definitions of 3-4
and the Epicureans—see Epicureans and rhetoric
and literature 25, 114
in Lucretius 1-4, 6, 9-10, 13-14, 23-26, 29-33, 43-50, 53-54, 59-61, 63-68, 71-73, 76-77, 81-83, 88, 91, 94, 96-98, 100-108, 113, 115-116
and poetry 110-111, 114-116
see arguments, rhetorical; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; rhetorical figures
Rhetorica ad Herennium
on appeal to pity, *commiseratio* 49-50
commonplaces in 25, 49-50
definition of rhetoric 3
on Ennius 34
on *enumeratio* 25
figures in 29, 44, 46-48, 53, 60-61, 63, 67-68, 76, 83, 88, 94, 96, 98, 100, 105
on Hannibal 16
and Lucretius 9
on parts of a speech 25
on rhetorical arguments 13-14, 22-23, 31; see Caplan, H.
rhetorical arguments, see arguments, rhetorical
rhetorical criticism 116
rhetorical figures, see *adiunctio*, *adnominatio*, alliteration, *amplificatio*, anaphora, antithesis, apostrophe, asyndeton, αὔξησις, chiasmus, *conduplicatio*, *conformatio*, *congeries*, *coniunctio*, *descriptio*, *enargeia*, *epiphonema*, homoeoptoton, homoeoteleuton, hyperbaton, hyperbole, isocolon, *licentia*, *notatio*, oxymoron, paronomasia, *parrhesia*, *permutatio*, polysyndeton, *prosopopoiia*, *sermocinatio*, simile, *similes exitus*, *similiter cadens*, *somotopoiia*, *superlatio*, *transgressio*, *transiectio*, wordplay
rhetorical questions 33, 54, 63-66, 71, 79, 82, 95, 101, 104; see diatribe, style of; Quintilian
rhyme 97, 105
ridicule 32, 41, 46, 54-57, 75, 94, 100-101, 104, 106-109
Roberts, W. Rhys 3, 113
Russell, D. A. 112-113

saecla, postera 78, 82
Sallust 56, 93
sarcasm 30-31, 53-57, 59, 104, 106-108
satire 1, 9, 28, 32, 41, 51, 57, 115
scattering of matter 58
Schmid, W. 5, 74
Schrijvers, P. H. 1, 10, 106
Scipio 95-96
scorn 46, 53-54, 86
Sellar, W. Y. 2-3
Seneca 74, 86
sensation, lack of 16, 18-20, 26, 38, 42, 51, 107; see concern; themes, diatribal, topics, Epicurean
sense perception 58
sentence
periodic 76
simple, short 7, 76, 82, 98, 104; see brevity

sentimentalism 47-51, 107
separation of soul and body 14, 18, 20-21, 24, 26, 35, 42
sermocinatio 46, 56, 94
sermon 32
Servius 83
sign 14-15, 20, 22, 58-59; see analogy; Philodemus
Sikes, E. E. 1-2
simile 80, 89, 100-101, 104
similes exitus, similiter desinens 76; see homoeoteleuton
similiter cadens 29; see homoeoptoton
sinners 86; see malefactors
Sisyphus 84, 86, 88, 91; see punishment after death; rational explanations
skolia, Attic 57
sleep, death as 52-54, 56, 58-59, 61, 79-80; see Bion of Borysthenes; themes, diatribal; topics, consolatory
soliloquy 92, 115
Solmsen, F. 3, 26, 87
somotopoiia 83
Sophists 89
soul, *anima* 18-22, 24, 26, 35, 58-59, 78, 99
spoudaiogeloion 7, 33, 35-36, 55, 58-60, 75, 77, 95, 99, 101, 104, 107-108
Stobaeus 64, 78, 89
Stoics 21, 27, 39, 69, 89-90, 110
Stork, T. 11, 15-16, 20, 38, 42, 76, 97, 102, 104, 106
stultus, foolish man 54, 66, 69, 71-72, 95; see *baratre*; interlocutor, imaginary; φησί
style 112-114
  archaic 103
  epic 9, 28, 96
  expository 60
  linear 60
  middle 9, 113
  mixture of 9
  pathetic 60
  poetry as model 112
  simple 48, 77
  straightforward 101
  virtues 5
  see diatribe
suicide 65
summary 23, 108
suspension of thought 81
superlatio 29; see hyperbole
superstition 84, 88, 90, 108
sweetness 48-49; see *dulces*; sentimentalism
syllogism 20, 24

Tantalus 84-86, 88-91; see punishment after death; rational explanations
Tartarus 77, 85; see punishment after death; rational explanations
Teles 8, 16-19, 38, 56, 69-70, 76, 80-81, 89-90, 103, 109
  Περὶ ἀπαθείας 16-19, 51, 54-55, 103, 105, 107
  Περὶ αὐταρκείας 61-64, 67, 69-70, 72, 80-81, 100
  Περὶ πενίας καὶ πλούτου 72, 85, 89-90, 99, 104-105
  Περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τέλος ἡδονήν 99
  Περὶ φυγῆς 33, 36, 39-41, 94, 107
  see Bion of Borysthenes; themes, diatribal
Terence 82
Tertullian 13
tetracolon 97
themes, diatribal 16-19, 37-41, 54-56, 64-65, 69-70, 72-74, 77-81, 89-90, 99, 104, 106-107
  acceptance of death 66, 71
  adaptation to circumstances 81
  apathy, ἀπάθεια 55, 103
  burial 33, 36-41, 55, 104
  contentment with one's lot 72, 80
  death as equalizer 94
  death as ἔσχατόν [τι] τῶν κακῶν 70
  death as fate of all 94
  death as sleep or time before birth 59, 79-80
  desire as an evil 90
  διδασκαλίαι of death 59, 79-80
  dissatisfaction, discontent 64, 69, 72-74, 80-81, 90, 93, 99, 104
  enslavement by passions 90
  exile 94, 106
  extravagant grief, foolishness of 55

fear of remaining unburied, stupidity of 37-41
foreign customs proving naturalness of actions 40
Fortune lends advantages 78-79
good man's ability to withstand fortune 103
good things possessed without wealth 66
greedy never content 72-73, 104
growing old in poverty not an evil 94
inability to profit from possessions 64, 72, 93
insatiable desire 90, 99, 104
insensibility or unconsciousness after death 16-19, 55
loss of concern 55
management of difficulties 80
μεμψιμοιρία 69-71, 73, 99
old age 72, 80
passionate love as an evil 90
φιλοπλουτία 69-71
poverty 80
quitting life as one leaving a banquet 64-65, 71
ridding oneself of emotions 103
self-accusation 94
self-examination 94
self-reproach 94
self-sufficiency, αὐτάρκεια 56, 81, 103
superstition, fear induced by religion 90
wise man removed from public affairs 90
see Bion of Borysthenes; Oltramare; topics, consolatory
Themistocles 94
Theocritus 1, 115
Theognis 57, 112
Theophrastus 73, 98; see *characterismos*; character sketch
thesis 6, 8; see diatribe; Throm
threnos 51
Throm, H. 6; see thesis
Tityos 84, 86, 88, 91; see punishment after death; rational explanations
tomb inscriptions, see inscriptions, tomb
topics
common 15, 19-20, 31, 39, 41, 49, 51, 53, 55-57, 59, 64-65, 72-74, 78-79, 92-93, 99, 104, 106-107, 109
consolatory 50-51, 106, 109
all men must die 104
closing of the eyes of the dead 36-38
dead escaping sorrows and uncertainty of life 104
dead person should have lived longer 47
death as common fate of all 93
death inescapable 92
death as sleep 52-53, 59, 79
grief of survivors 47, 51-55
life as a loan 78
loss of friendship and joys 47
manifestations of grief 51, 55
sorrow appropriate 51
sorrow of children and spouse 51
diatribal—see themes, diatribal
Epicurean 12-13, 18-22, 26-27, 35, 42, 51, 54-56, 58-59, 64-65, 70, 73-74, 77-78, 80, 82, 85-90, 97-99, 104, 107
topos 15, 19, 39, 73, 104; see topics, common
transgressio 29; see hyperbaton
transiectio 48, 53, 61, 76
tricolon 96-97; see crescendo
Tristia, see Ovid
Tusculan Disputations, see Cicero

unconsciousness, lack of consciousness 35, 45, 58-59, 79-80, 102; see themes, diatribal; topics, Epicurean
Usener, H. 4-6, 74

Vallette, P. 10, 40-41
Van Rooy, C. A. 7
variety, variation 9, 46
Varro, M. Terentius 41
Varro Atacinus, P. Terentius 113
vas 64
Vergil 26, 49, 90, 111
vice 91
virtue 66

Wallach, L. iii, 2, 9, 13
Waltz, R. 1, 47

Waszink, J. H. 13, 116
weeping, see topics, consolatory: manifestations of grief
West, David 4, 54, 84, 89-91
Wichelns, H. A. 116
Wilkinson, L. P. 48
Winterbottom, M. 112-113
Woltjer, J. 10, 55, 64, 73
wordplay 30, 44, 48, 61, 67-68, 76, 83, 96; see *adnominatio*
words, position of 29-30, 35, 43-44
world, destruction of 26-28

Xerxes 93-94, 96-97

Zeno of Citium 89